

The Slavic and East European Journal

New Series, Vol. V (XIX), No. 1

Spring 1961

CONTENTS

Some Consequences of the Lack of a Definite and Indefinite Article in Russian . . . R. F. Christian	1
St. Francis Xavier and Marko Marulić. Ante Kadić	12
The Problem of Vocabulary in Russian Texts for Beginners Nicholas P. Vakar	19
Observations of Language Teaching in the Soviet Union Symond Yavener	33
High School Russian: No English from the First Day Wayne D. Fisher	41
A Tentative List of Colleges and Universities Offering Russian, Fall 1960 Ilse Remer and June Barlow	46

REVIEWS

Renato Poggioli, <u>The Poets of Russia:</u> <u>1890-1930</u> Oleg Maslenikov	57
Richard Freeborn, <u>Turgenev: The Novelist's</u> <u>Novelist</u> Ralph E. Matlaw	58
G. M. Gajdenkov, ed., <u>Russkie poëty XIX veka:</u> <u>Xrestomatija</u> John Fizer	61
Ludwik Krzyżanowski, ed., <u>Joseph Conrad: Centennial</u> <u>Essays</u> Edward J. Czerwinski	62
Stepas Zobarskas, ed., <u>Selected Lithuanian Short</u> <u>Stories</u> (2nd ed.) A. Šešplaukis	64
Grigore Nandriș, <u>Old Church Slavonic Grammar (Hand-</u> <u>book of Old Church Slavonic, I), and R. Auty, Texts</u> <u>and Glossary (Handbook of Old Church</u> <u>Slavonic, II)</u> George Y. Shevelov	64
Marianna Poltoratzky and Michael Zarechnak, <u>Russkij</u> <u>jazyk: Pervaja kniga</u> Sigmund S. Birkenmayer	67
Ten Years of <u>Onomastica</u> John P. Pauls	68

Helene Iswolsky, <u>Christ in Russia: The History Tradition, and Life of the Russian Church</u>	Matthew Spinka	69
John M. Hazard, <u>Settling Disputes in Soviet Society: The Formative Years of Legal Institutions</u>	Serge L. Levitsky	70
<u>Ukrains'ka radians'ka encyklopedija, Vol. I</u>	Vasyl Markus	71
Stanley W. Page, <u>The Formation of the Baltic States</u>	Emanuel Nodel	72
Altamur Kilic, <u>Turkey and the World</u>	Ivar Spector	74
Recent Works in East European Folklore	Archer Taylor	75
Brief Notices		77
Books Received		84
NEWS AND NOTES		87
AATSEEL Constitution and Bylaws		98

Editor

J. T. Shaw, Indiana Univ. (Bloomington)

Associate Editors

Morton Benson, Univ. of Pennsylvania
 Wayne Fisher, Canton Senior High School, Canton, Ill.
 Edward Stankiewicz, Indiana Univ.
 Walter Vickery, Indiana Univ.
 Helen Yakobson, George Washington Univ.

Review Editor

Felix J. Oinas, Indiana Univ.

Editorial Committee

Victor Erlich, Zbigniew Folejewski, William E. Harkins,
 Rev. Walter C. Jaskiewicz, S.J., Claude P. Lemieux, Horace
 Lunt, Oleg A. Maslenikov, J. B. Rudnyćkyj, Anthony Salys,
 Thomas A. Sebeok, Gleb Struve, Nicholas Vakar, René Wellek

Business Manager

Edmund Ordon
 Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan

SOME CONSEQUENCES OF THE LACK OF A DEFINITE AND INDEFINITE ARTICLE IN RUSSIAN

By R. F. Christian

University of Birmingham, England

Little or no attention has been paid to the question what means Russian has of compensating for the lack of a definite and indefinite article. The purpose of this note is to consider the question from the point of view of the English speaker concerned with rendering as precisely as possible the various shades of meaning which can be expressed in English by the articles. It is not our intention to examine all the functions of the English articles; our aim is to concentrate on those functions, the precise translation of which into Russian modifies the syntax of the Russian sentence.

We shall consider first of all the translation into Russian of the English articles by various parts of speech, notably the pronoun, the preposition and the adverb, and we shall begin by examining some of the most important uses of the indefinite article a. Perhaps its most characteristic use is to indicate that a person or object is not unique, but only one specimen of many similar persons or objects. It is not merely indefinite. It has various degrees of indeterminacy. In its most indeterminate sense, a can mean something or other, someone or other, indefinite and unidentified. This meaning may be idiomatically rendered in Russian by the particle -nibud' (or its more formal alternative -libo). Unbegaun¹ writes "... the particles -nibud' and -libo indicate a person or object the very existence of which is not certain." This is the precise meaning of a in such sentences as the following: he is looking for a job (he may not find one; there may be no job for him); I hope that we shall soon reach a village (but we may not; there may not be one). The article may therefore be

exactly rendered by kakoj-nibud': 'on iščet kakuju-nibud' rabotu; ja nadejus', čto my skoro dojdem do kakoj-nibud' derevni.'

In a rather less indeterminate sense a can mean something or other, someone or other, still unidentified but nevertheless in a known state of existence. In this sense the particle -to is the Russian equivalent of a. "The particle -to indicates an existing but unidentified person or object."² The distinction between -to and -nibud' in rendering the English indefinite article is clearly brought out by comparing the above sentences with the following: he has found a job, but I do not know what he is doing 'on našel kakuju-to rabotu, no ja ne znaju, čem on zanimaetsja'; we soon came to a village 'my skoro došli do kakoj-to derevni.'

Two meanings may be conveyed by the indefinite article in a sentence like I bought these gloves at a shop in London. The sentence may mean that I do not remember at which shop I bought them, but that I do know it was somewhere in London. It may also mean that I know which shop it was, but that I do not wish to, or have no need to identify it. In the former case it can be translated by kakoj-to: 'ja kupil èti perčatki v kakom-to magazine v Londone' (a definite shop, but I do not know which one). In the latter case it can be translated by odin: 'ja kupil èti perčatki v odnom magazine v Londone' (a certain shop which I know and could identify if I wished). Again, in the sentence I was told that a lady wished to see me, the translation 'mne skazali, čto kakaja-to dama xočet menja videt'' would imply that the person giving the message has no idea who the lady is, while 'mne skazali, čto odna dama xočet menja videt'' implies that the speaker does know, although he does not, as it happens, identify her (a certain lady). Collinson writes "A certain occupies from one point of view an intermediate position between definite and indefinite indication. To the speaker the indication is definite either because he knows the particular item but will not say, or because he at least knows that there is a particular item which fulfils his condition. To him it is a 'provisional demonstrative'. . . To the hearer, a certain is indefinite, for he must at once ask 'which?'"³

Odin in this sense of a certain is commonly used in Russian to translate the English indefinite article: an old friend of mine once sent me this pipe (sc. I know who it was) 'odin

moj staryj drug kogda-to poslal mne ètu trubku.' Or again, he was talking about a rich man known to us both 'on govorel ob odnom bogače, izvestnom nam oboim.' But it should be added that the possessive adjective without odin may also correspond to 'a. . . of mine' ('yours,' etc.); the correct translation of Istorija moego sovremennika (Korolenko) is The Story of a Contemporary of Mine and not The Story of My Contemporary.

The indefinite article preceding a proper name is normally translated by kakoj-to or nekij: a Mr. Jones rang you up 'kakoj-to (nekij) g. Džons pozvonil vam po telefonu.' Zagoretskij in Gore of uma says, "S kakim-to Čackim ja kogda-to byl znakom" I did once know a Čackij. In these examples a qualifies an unidentified person with the surname Jones or Čackij. Odin is not used, precisely because the person is not identified from among all the possible Joneses and Čackijs.

The English indefinite article has many other functions besides denoting degrees of indeterminacy. It may have a weakly numerical sense, in which case it will be translated by odin: in a word 'odnim slovom'; just a moment 'odnu minutu'; Rome was not built in a day 'Rim byl postroen ne v odin den'; all to a man 'vse do odnogo.' It may mean one of: then odin iz, or in some contexts iz, will be an appropriate rendering: the properties of a salt 'svojstva odnoj iz solej' (cf. the properties of salt 'svojstva soli'); he was looking at a Raphael Madonna 'on smotrel na odnu iz Rafaelovyx Madonn'; his mother was an Obolenskij 'ego mat' byla iz Obolenskix.' Again it may mean the same, one and the same, and here too odin is the normal rendering: birds of a feather 'Odnogo polja jagoda (-y), odnim lykom šity.'

English a may have a derogatory sense—some sort of a—and in some contexts a pronoun, and in others an adverb will convey the desired meaning in Russian. The following translations of in a way are taken from Kunin:⁴ You know, in a way, Gideon, you were wrong and they were right 'znaete, Gideon, v kakom-to smysle oni byli pravy, a vy net'; it was so easy and in a way so legitimate 'èto bylo tak legko i do izvestnoj stepeni tak zakonno'; that is true in a way 'vy, požaluj, pravy'; she liked him too in a way 'on i ej kak budto nravilsja.'

When a means each or every it will have to be translated into Russian by a preposition. Twice a week (each week)

'dva raza v nedelju'; of a Sunday (every Sunday) 'po voskresen'-jam'; two shillings a tin 'po dva šilinga banka.' It will be noticed that in English the definite, as well as the indefinite, article is used distributively with numbers—two shillings the tin being an exact synonym of two shillings a tin.

The exclamation what a . . . ! is frequently the cue to use čto za in Russian (what an idea! 'čto za ideja!'). It should, however, be emphasised that the indefinite article is no more common than the definite in this exclamatory sense (it's a beautiful town—but the smells! 'èto krasivyy gorod—no čto za zapaxil!')

Finally, before leaving the indefinite article and the extent to which it is rendered in Russian by certain parts of speech, it is worth noting that takoj may often be translated by a when the meaning is one which: e.g., 'sovetskaja promyšlennost' idet na takom urovne, kotoryj na 5 procentov vyše 1951 goda' Soviet industry has reached (is running at) a level which is 5% higher than in 1951. The same pronoun, takoj, on the other hand, is most naturally rendered by the definite article when the meaning is the sort of: 'ja vernulsja s takim čuvstvom, kak budto ja videl ploxoj son' I came back with the feeling that I had had a bad dream.

Turning now to the definite article, we can say that one of its characteristic functions is that of a weak demonstrative pronoun—this or that. Consequently the pronouns ètot or tot will often be needed in Russian, where the English has this weakly demonstrative sense: something of the kind 'čto-to v ètom rode'; at the time I was still a boy 'v èto (to) vremja ja ešče byl mal'čikom.' In these cases, indeed, the may readily be replaced by this or that. But sometimes this substitution is not possible in English, and the use of tot is therefore more surprising, e.g.: the fact that he agreed means nothing 'tot fakt, čto on soglasilsja, ničego ne označaeť'; the fact is that he is a fraud 'fakt tot, čto on obmanščik.' A further, idiomatic, use of tot is in the set expression 'i tomu podobnoe' and the like (on the origin and meaning of the article in this expression see P. Christophersen).⁵

The pronoun tot is a very common antecedent to a relative clause in cases where English is content with the definite article: He wanted to do the things which he usually hadn't time to do 'on xotel sdelat' te dela, kotorye obyčno ne uspeval delat'; she was looking in the direction from which the boat

was to come 'ona smotrela v tu storonu, otkuda dolžna byla pojavit'sja lodka.' However, if the relative clause is expressed in Russian by a participle, tot cannot then be used: He walked up to the huge building which extended over a whole block 'on podošel k tomu ogromnomu domu, kotoryj rastjanulsja na celyj kvartal' (finite verb in relative clause), but 'on podošel k ogromnomu domu, rastjanuvšemusja na celyj kvartal' (examples from A. N. Gvozdev).⁶

Another characteristic function of the definite article which cannot be ignored when translating into Russian is that of emphasis. Here, too, the use of a pronoun is called for: Not the Mr. Dickens? 'neuželi tot samyj g. Dikkens?' ('ne tot li samyj g. Dikkens?'); he was one of the first, if not the first 'on byl odnim iz pervyx, esli ne samym pervym.'

In certain classifying contexts (e.g., something of the professor, i.e., something in common with the class of people, professors), a Russian adjective formed from the class noun is often the best translation of English noun plus definite article: there is something of the child about her 'v nej est' čto-to detskoe.'

In a very different context, where the definite article is tied to a comparative adverb and is equivalent to by this much or by that much, the Russian instrumental case of to or čto qualifies the comparative: the more the merrier 'čem bol'se, tem lučše.'

It is interesting to compare English and Russian practice in cognate expressions such as up the (a) hill and uphill, or down the (a) hill and downhill, where the adverb generalises and the article particularises. The difference is conveyed in Russian by the choice of an appropriate preposition: he climbed up the hill 'on podnjalsja na goru'; for several hours he walked up hill 'neskol'ko časov on šel v goru.' Similarly down the hill 's gory' but down hill 'pod goru.' The choice of the preposition v as opposed to na with nouns denoting means of transport can again suggest the difference between the particular and the general—the particular in this context being a given journey in a given vehicle (article) and the general an adverbialised expression denoting travel in a class of vehicle (no article). Compare three boys and their father were travelling in the (a) car 'tri mal'čika s otcom exali v mašine'; travel by car is more convenient than by train 'udobnee ezdit' na mašine, čem na poezde.'

So far we have been dealing with examples where the presence or absence of an article in English has a discernible effect on the Russian rendering of a phrase, involving the use of a part of speech—pronoun, adverb, or preposition. There are, of course, many other cases where there is no compensating mechanism. Whether we say It's Picasso (the man) or it's a Picasso (one of his paintings), Russian will say simply 'èto Pikasso.' Whether we say it happened on Monday (i. e., last Monday), it happened on a Monday (not necessarily the last one) or it happened on the Monday (a particular Monday identifiable by the context), Russian will say 'èto slučilos' v ponedel'nik,' and leave the context to make it clear if a particular Monday is intended. 'Èto ne Stravinskij' will translate both he is not Stravinsky and he is not a Stravinsky; if a Russian wished to be more precise and say he is no longer the Stravinsky of the 1910's he would still probably say 'èto uže ne Stravinskij 1910-x godov.' While there are minor semantic nuances conveyed by the articles in these English examples, it can hardly be said that Russian loses much in precision by not expressing them; and this impression is borne out by an examination of other similar examples not listed here.

Turning now from the parts of speech, we can ask is it ever possible for the precise use of cases to compensate for the lack of an article in Russian. Two possible illustrations come to mind—the parallel use of the partitive genitive and the accusative of nouns signifying a divisible mass, and the use of both accusative and genitive cases after a small group of verbs, notably iskat', prosit', sprašivat', trebovat', ždat', želat', and xotet'. To take the partitive genitive first 'Peredajte mne xleba' pass me some bread indicates that I want some of the substance, bread, i. e., a slice. 'Peredajte mne xleb' pass me the bread, on the other hand, means that I want all the bread to be passed (the plateful, the loaf). The Russian accusative is the equivalent of the article: the Russian genitive is the equivalent of 'zero indication' or the absence of the article. Similarly, "monaxi dali deneg pod bol'šoj rost" (Alexej Tolstoj) would be translated into English by the monks lent money at a big interest, whereas 'voz'mite den'gi kotorye ležat na stole' means take the money lying on the table. Again one can compare 'student otpil piva' the student had a drink of beer with 'čerez minutu on dopil pivo i

ušel' a minute later he drank up the beer and left. The relationship between these and many similar examples is that of the correspondence between zero indication and the partitive genitive on the one hand, and the article and the accusative case on the other.

The second context in which there appears to be a connection between the articles in English and the choice of case in Russian is that of a noun governed by one of the verbs listed in the previous paragraph (to seek, to ask, to demand, to await, to desire, to wish). It frequently happens that when the noun object in such a context is inanimate the use of the article in English (whether definite or indefinite) is the cue to use the accusative case in Russian, while the absence of the article in English frequently calls for a genitive in Russian. The general principle with these verbs is for an accusative case to follow them if the object is individualised or particularised (most commonly concrete objects, which are much more readily particularised than abstract nouns), and for a genitive case to follow if the object, although concrete, is used figuratively. For example: he is looking for the brief case he has lost 'on iščet poterjannyj portfel'; she asked for an entry visa for the U.S.S.R. 'ona poprosila vizu na v'ezd v S.S.S.R.'; much excited by your news and eagerly await the manuscript "očen' vzvolnovan vašim soobščeniem i ždu rukopis' neterpelivo" (Gor'kij); conversely to ask for advice 'sprašivat' soveta'; to expect mercy 'ždat' poščady'; to demand accuracy 'trebovat' točnosti.' At first sight there seems to be an identification between positive indication (the articles) and the accusative case on the one hand, and zero indication (absence of the articles) and the genitive on the other. But this correspondence, although it holds good in a great many instances, is an unreal one in so far as abstract nouns in English which in the given context appear in the genitive in Russian may themselves be qualified by articles: to ask for an explanation 'trebovat' ob'jasnenija'; to look for an opportunity 'iskat' slučaja.'

If the choice of cases provides little material that is relevant, word order may be a more fruitful field of study, for, to a limited extent, the comparative freedom of Russian word order makes it possible to convey certain definite and indefinite shades of meaning, which is one of the important functions of the English articles. By altering the position of

the noun subject in a Russian sentence, an effect can be achieved which is the same as that achieved by substituting one article for the other in English. The difficulty is, however, that we cannot say that the subject normally precedes the verb in a Russian sentence. It depends on the verb. With the majority of verbs it is normal for the subject to precede; but with certain types of verbs the reverse is true.

To take first the case where the verb normally follows the noun subject of the sentence, here inversion of the normal order can correspond to the replacement of the definite by the indefinite article in English. This is especially true when the noun refers to a person or thing which is mentioned for the first time (indefinite article). To mention it a second time is already to give it the status of something known (definite article). For example: "Priexala iz goroda staršaja sestra k men'šej v derevnju. Staršaja za kupcom byla v gorode, a men'šaja za mužikom v derevne." (L. N. Tolstoj.) An elder sister came from town to visit her younger sister in the country. The elder sister was married to a merchant in the town, the younger to a peasant in the country. Or again: "V polovine dvenadcatogo s severo-zapada, so storony derevni Čmarovki, v Stargorod vošel molodoj čelovek let dvadcati vos'mi. Za nim bežal besprizornyj... Molodoj čelovek vynul iz karmana nagretoe jabloko i podal ego besprizornomy..." At half-past eleven a young man of about 28 entered Stargorod from the north-west, from the direction of the village of Čmarovka. A waif ran after him... The young man took a warm apple out of his pocket and gave it to the waif. (Il'f and Petrov.)

With verbs which normally precede the noun subject of a sentence, inversion can have the same result. Common verbs of this sort are those denoting being, existing, coming into existence, passing out of existence (byt', byvat', nastavat', nastupat', proxodit': e.g., 'prošlo sto let' a hundred years passed). When this normal (inverted) order is itself inverted, and the verb follows the noun, the same degree of individualisation can be achieved as is achieved by the definite article in English: "oni tverдили 'do skoroj vstreči, do skoroj vstreči... i vot vstreča nastupila" (Fedin) They kept on repeating 'till we meet again soon, till we meet again soon' (lit. 'to a speedy meeting')... and now the meeting had come.

Another group of verbs with a common meaning of begin, or arise (e.g., proisxodit', vspyxivat', vznikat', razыgryvat'sja

razdavat'sja, razgorat'sja) also normally precede the noun subject. Thus 'proizošel nesčastnyj slučaj' an accident occurred; 'vspyknul požar' a fire broke out. If the noun subject precedes these verbs it is often because it is strongly individualised, and a comparison with the English definite article is again possible. For example: "s polunoči podnjalas' burja, no poutru rano korabl' uže minoval Lido. V tečenie dnja burja razygralas' s strašnoj siloj. . ." (Turgenev.) At midnight a storm arose, but by early morning the ship had already passed the Lido. During the day the storm burst forth with terrible violence. . . Compare also 'razrazilas' groza, zagremel grom' a storm broke out, it began to thunder with 'groza razrazilas', 'kogda my šli domoj' the thunderstorm broke as we were walking home.

It may be possible to establish some further correspondence between the English articles and Russian word-order by examining the position of the noun complement in relation to the subject in sentences containing the verbs to be, to become, to prove to be, and cognate verbs (e.g., stanovit'sja, delat'sja, sčitat'sja, kazat'sja, okazyvat'sja). If we translate the sentence The colonel turned out to be a traitor, the natural word order in Russian will be 'polkovnik okazalsja izmennikom', with the predicate following the verb. Similarly the traitor turned out to be a colonel, 'izmennik okazalsja polkovnikom.' If, on the other hand, the Russian word-order is reversed, with the predicate preceding the verb, the sentence 'izmennikom okazalsja polkovnik' would correspond most naturally to the meaning the traitor turned out to be the colonel, or alternatively, the colonel turned out to be the traitor (it was the colonel who turned out to be the traitor) and would presuppose a context where treachery has already been referred to. It is in fact only within the broader context in which a sentence is placed that the significance of word order in a given sentence can be properly understood. Considerable research will have to be done before any generalisations can be drawn from examples such as the above, and in any case only tendencies, not rules, could be established. Nevertheless the problem clearly deserves investigation.

The semantic implications of the presence or absence of the article in English verb-noun combinations are of vital importance for the purpose of correct translation into Russian. The three following examples illustrate three aspects of the

question. In all cases the combination verb-article-noun is contrasted with the combination verb-noun, where the verb and noun are identical.

First—to catch a cold and to catch cold. There is virtually no difference in meaning between these expressions in English and they could both be equally well translated by either 'sxvatit' prostudu' or 'prostudit'sja.' It should be said in passing that within the context of a sentence they are not necessarily interchangeable. If we wish to translate he caught a cold from me (we do not say he caught cold from me) we shall not be able to say 'on sxvatil prostudu ot menja' or 'on prostudilsja ot menja': the best equivalent in Russian might be 'on zarazilsja ot menja nasmorkom.' The point, however, is that the presence or absence of the article in this particular verb-noun combination is of no real semantic significance. Secondly—to shut up the shop and to shut up shop. Here the definite article particularises, whereas zero indication, or the absence of an article, generalises, and by extension creates a new idiom. While this idiom may be rendered by the literal translation 'zakryt' lavočku' in quotation marks, it will be more appropriate to paraphrase than to translate, using in turn an idiomatic Russian equivalent such as 'svernut' delo.' Thirdly—to leave the school and to leave school. In this, and many similar examples, the verbs are homonyms and the concealed difference of meaning in English has to be brought out by the use of the appropriate verb in Russian—'ujti iz školy,' 'okončit' školu.'

A further possible verb-article-noun combination is that involving the definite article on the one hand and the indefinite article on the other, both verb and noun again being identical. To have the nerve 'imet' mužestvo' is obviously very different from to have a nerve 'naxal'ničat'.' Examples of this sort, however, present no difficulties to the translator in view of the radical change of meaning involved.

We have not so far considered the articles in combination with adjectives and nouns. A final example may illustrate an interesting correspondence between English a whole, the whole and Russian celyj and ves'. Often celyj and ves' are interchangeable in Russian. But when a whole means a considerable, a very big. . . , only celyj and not ves' may be used. For example, The first Russian revolution represents a whole

historical period in the development of our country 'pervaja russkaja revolucija predstavljajet celuju istoričeskiju polosu v razvitii našej strany' (Short Course of the History of the CPSU [B]). In a different context, there is a subtle distinction between celyj a whole and ves' the whole in the following sentences: I lived a whole year in Moscow 'ja prožil celyj god v Moskve' (not any one year in particular); I lived the whole year in Moscow 'ja prožil ves' god v Moskve' (a particular year, the year in question).

It is not possible here to consider all the implications of the lack of articles in Russian. We have concentrated on certain grammatical and lexical features—the parts of speech, the cases, word order, and the choice of words—which are all to some extent relevant to the problem of the translation of the English articles into Russian. The material presented may, it is hoped, provide a basis for further investigation.

Notes

1. B. O. Unbegaun, Russian Grammar (Oxford, 1957), p. 130.
2. Unbegaun, p. 130.
3. W. E. Collinson, Indication (Supplement to Language, Baltimore, 1937), p. 29.
4. A. V. Kunin, Anglo-russki frazeologičeskii slovar' (Moskva, 1955), p. 1172.
5. P. Christophersen, The Articles (Copenhagen, 1939), pp. 117-120.
6. A. N. Gvozdev, Očerki: Po stilistike russkogo yazyka (2nd ed., Moskva, 1955), p. 182.

ST. FRANCIS XAVIER AND MARKO MARULIĆ

By Ante Kadić

Indiana University

I read recently with great pleasure what is, to my knowledge, the best biography of St. Francis Xavier, by James Brodrick, S. J. Great was my surprise to find that the author considered it unimportant even to mention, if indeed he was aware of, the name of Marko Marulić (1450-1524), the great philosopher whose book De institutione bene vivendi was very popular during the Counter-Reformation period. Witness the following passage: "The only book, besides his Breviary and a species of catechism, which Francis is known for certain to have taken (leaving Rome, 1540), still exists, a thick little volume, published at Cologne in 1531, containing excerpts from the Scriptures, St. Jerome, St. Gregory the Great, Eusebius, Cassian, and other ecclesiastical writers. Possibly, it was St. Jerome's contribution which attracted Francis to the anthology. He is known to have carried the book about with him in India, but . . . he made no mark of any kind on the pages."¹ Not only Father Brodrick, but also others seem ignorant of the name of the author of this important book.² There are, on the other hand, some writers who do mention Marulić's name, but one feels that they are a little bit embarrassed at not knowing exactly who he was or where he came from. Thus in the well-written biography of St. Francis by Margaret Yeo, we read: "Francis had twenty-four hours to make his preparations. They were soon finished. He mended his torn soutane and put together the few possessions he was to take with him—crucifix, breviary and Marcus Marulus' Institution of the Religious Life. All three are still extant, the breviary at Nantes, the other two at Madrid."³

The purpose of this short article is to show, with my conclusions based chiefly on the recent scholarly publications of the Jesuit Order (Documenta Historica Societatis Jesu), how significant was the role played by Marulić's book in the

spiritual life of St. Francis; I shall attempt, at the same time, to bring forth some fundamental information about the author of the De institutione bene vivendi.

At the beginning of April 1549, St. Francis wrote an Instruction for F. Gaspar Barzaeus (Berze), who was leaving Goa for Ormuz, just eight days before Xavier left the same city bound for Japan. In this famous Instruction, Francis encouraged Barzaeus to mix with sinners, telling him that he would learn more from them than from printed books: "And if you wish to bring forth much fruit, both for yourselves and for your neighbors, and to live consoled, converse with sinners, making them unburden themselves to you. These are the living books by which you are to study, both for your preaching and for your own consolation. I do not say that you should not on occasion read written books . . . to support what you say against vices with authorities from the Holy Scriptures and examples from the lives of the saints."⁴

Fathers G. Schurhammer and I. Wicki, who edited this Instruction among Epistolae S. Francisci Xaverii, add the following comment to the passage quoted: "Xaverius on his journeys continually used, besides his Breviary, one other book which contained excerpts taken from Holy Writ and the lives of the saints, a very rich source of ideas and thoughts for use in preaching and instructing. The title of this book was: Marci Maruli Opus de religiose vivendi institutione per exempla, ex veteri novoque testamento collecta: ex autoribus quoque divo Hieronymo presbytero, beato Gregorio Pont. Max., Eusebio Caesariensi episcopo, Iohanne Cassiano eremita, nonnullisque aliis qui vitas conscripsere sanctorum. Apud Sanctam Coloniam. Anno 1531; mense Ianuario."⁵

A few months later, in the middle of October 1549, F. Balthasar Gago sent from Goa to his religious brothers in Europe a very detailed letter, in which, among other things, he informed his coreligionists that they had not received in Goa any news from St. Francis since his departure for Japan, and he gave then names of those who went with him. Further, he mentioned that Xavier took with him "all things necessary for the celebration of the Mass, and books if they should be necessary (although Father Francisco neither reads nor studies but in his own book)."⁶ Father Wicki, who edited Documenta Indica, in which Gago's letter is found, adds a very brief note to this extremely characteristic passage:

"The title of this book is: Marci Maruli Opus de religiose vivendi institutione (Coloniae 1531). The author, a patrician from Split, was considered by his contemporaries as the luminary of Dalmatia—a coaevis velut luminare Dalmatiae habebatur."⁷ He then gives as the only source for his information about Marulić the comment to the Epistolae (II, 99), already quoted, and H. Hurter's Nomenclator. Hurter knew a little more about Marulić because his short notice about Marulić was taken from a provincial Italian periodical, published in 1844!⁸

After the death of St. Francis (December 3, 1552), much was written about him, especially by his religious brothers. F. Antonius de Quadros wrote a long letter (from Goa, on December 6, 1555) to F. Mirón. In this missive are to be found these lines: "Master Francis was always extremely poor in everything and he was delighted by this poverty. Here, in our monastery, when he asked for something to eat, he did it as beggars do, in the name of God. When he was going away, his only belongings were the cloth he was wearing, the breviary and one other book."⁹ Again the only reference given is the comment to the Epistolae (II, 99). What happened to this "one other book?" Did the Fathers keep it as a precious relic?

Fr. Cros saw it, in 1894, in a convent in Madrid and gave the following details: "On the second page is written: I received this Marco Marulo from Fr. Jerome Xavier, Superior of the monastery in Goa. He gave it to me so that I might give it to Father de Benavides, saying that he held it in great esteem, because it was the spiritual book which was used by Father and Master Francisco Xavier, of holy memory. This book I carried with me from Goa, and gave it to the said Father de Benavides, in the month of October 1594, in this college in Madrid. Gil de Mata." Father Cros continued the description of the external appearance of this relic: "All the pages are absolutely clean; there are no marginal notes, which spoil so many other books, but which would have made of this book an even more precious treasure. Francis was already observing the rule, which the Society was soon to impose upon all of its sons, that they should not write nor mark anything on books."¹⁰

Father Cros wrote in 1894. Nobody checked later to see if this book was still in Madrid, but all biographers, on

the basis of his information, repeated not only the place of its custody, but made various comments about the clean appearance of the book.

Unfortunately, this important copy probably no longer exists. How long has it been missing? According to F. Raspudić—since 1931. From his article, which was published in Croatian Almanac in 1954, I quote: "What happened to this book, I could not discover. It is most probable that it was destroyed in the burning of the Jesuit monastery in Madrid in 1931, but the possibility is not excluded that this valuable relic was saved from destruction and perhaps is being kept in some safe place. The Jesuit Fathers could not give me any details about it."¹¹

* * *

Marko Marulić¹² was, first of all, a Latin author. While his classical education, his interest in the Roman monuments of Split and ancient Salona, and his highly praised poems in Latin stamped him as a humanist, he had nevertheless become a zealous Christian moralist. In a period of declining moral values, Marulić, in many of his Latin works, insisted upon strict morality as the only sure basis of life. His books, written clearly and convincingly, showed their author's extensive reading and attracted to him many readers and admirers throughout Europe.

His most famous book, De institutione bene vivendi (printed in Venice, in 1506, its original title slightly changed with each new edition) was frequently reprinted in Venice, Basel, Cologne, Antwerp, and Paris; it was translated into Italian, German, French, Portuguese, and Czech.¹³ The main reason for its popularity was the fact that during the whole period of the Counter-Reformation it was considered the most useful book for Catholics in the defense of their ancestral faith.¹⁴

Marulić also wrote lyric and epic poems in Latin. His most extensive work of this type, Davidias, remained unpublished. During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries Croatian scholars searched throughout Europe for the manuscript of this work. It did not come to light until 1952, when an Italian scholar, Carlo Dionisotti, found a copy of it in the National Library of Turin. The Yugoslav Academy's edition, with Josip Badalić's substantial and valuable Introduction,

was published in the series Stari pisci hrvatski (Vol. XXXI, Zagreb, 1954). Miroslav Marković has also published an edition of Davidias (University of Mérida, Venezuela, 1957), which appears to be closer to Marulić's original; unfortunately, this second edition claims to be an "editio princeps" and does not contain any evaluation of the work itself.¹⁵ The Davidias is an epic in fourteen books treating the life of King David as a prefiguration of the life of Christ. As Mirko Usmiani states, "Marulić was the first humanist to compose a poem of such size and scope, and the only one who chose his hero from the old Testament."¹⁶ Despite a dedication to the powerful Cardinal Grimani, the censor would not allow Davidias to be printed. Several hypotheses have been advanced to explain why Davidias was not printed; the most plausible of these is that Marulić's Messianic interpretation of the events of David's life often did not accord with orthodox teaching.¹⁷

In the Preface of his Inscriptiones Salonitanae Antiquae, which later were published by the historian Ivan Lucić, Marulić informs us about the pitiful conditions of his native land, devastated by Turkish hordes, and about how he mourned, repeating Vergil's verses: "Fuimus Troes, fuit Ilium . . ." Prompted by the same love, he sent to Hadrian VII an Epistle begging the Pope to exhort all Christian rulers to join in the common enterprise against the Turks.

But it is not for these Latin works, their world-wide reputation notwithstanding, that Marulić is still remembered by his countrymen.¹⁸ He is dear to the hearts of the Croats and other Yugoslavs because he wrote (in 1501) the epic poem Judith in their native language;¹⁹ he tried by it to encourage his oppressed countrymen in their struggle against the Turks and to give them a message of hope that finally, with God's help, they would overcome all difficulties.

Marulić followed, he admits in the Preface, the older Croatian religious poetry, as far as the subject was concerned, and the Classics in regard to its treatment. It is important that in following the Classics he did not mechanically transplant Latin forms into his native tongue, but depended upon his own poetic abilities. Thus Marulić depicted a number of concrete and, at times, very realistic scenes, with many clear comparisons taken from his own experience, in a language which, despite all his humanistic culture, often abounded in the picturesque speech of peasants and shepherds. When

free from the bonds of the Classics, he reveals features of a good poet with deep emotions.

In his shorter Croatian poems, as in his Latin works, Marulić preaches piety. In these poems one finds sharp criticisms of the social conditions of his times and of the depravity in the ranks of the Catholic Church. The most touching of his shorter poems, "Molitva suprotiva Turkom" (Prayer against Turks), presents a realistic picture of the horrors caused by the Turks in the Balkan regions. In this magnificent poem Marulić opened his warm heart to the Almighty, asking mercy for his Croatian people because their sufferings had already reached an infernal climax.

While Marulić in Split was ridding himself of medieval patterns, a whole galaxy of other poets began to rise in Dubrovnik, Zadar, Šibenik, and on the Island of Hvar. They were all children of the Renaissance, but not one failed to pay a tribute of indebtedness to their leader. Aware of the freshness of Marulić's Croatian work and glimpsing the new and wider horizons it opened for them, they raised him in their dedications to the pinnacle of fame.

Notes

1. James Brodrick, S. J., Saint Francis Xavier (1506-1552) (New York, 1952), p. 96.
2. See Edith Ann Stewart, The Life of St. Francis Xavier (London, 1917), p. 118.
3. Margaret Yeo, St. Francis Xavier (London, 1932), p. 69. See also Theodore Maynard, The Odyssey of Francis Xavier (London, 1936), p. 68; Georg Schurhammer, S. J., Franz Xaver, Erster band: Europa (1506-1541) (Freiburg, 1955), p. 534.
4. G. Schurhammer and I. Wicki, eds., Epistolae S. Francisci Xaverii, II (Romae, 1945), 99. Cf. A. Brou, S. J., Saint François Xavier, II (Paris, 1922), 98-99.
5. Epistolae, II, 99 n. 22.
6. Joseph Wicki, S. J., ed., Documenta Indica, I (Romae, 1948), 554.
7. Documenta Indica, I, 554 n. 18.
8. Hugo Hurter, S. J., Nomenclator literarius Theologiae Catholicae (Oeniponte, 1899), II, 1152.
9. Joseph Wicki, S. J., ed., Documenta Indica, III (Romae, 1954), 335. See also Monumenta Xaveriana, II (Madrid, 1912), 952. Jos.-Marie Cros, S. J., Saint François de Xavier: Documents nouveaux (Paris, 1903), p. 446.
10. Jos.-Marie Cros, pp. 351-352.
11. Prof. F. Bruno Raspudić, "Marko Marulić i sv. Franjo Keaverski," in Hrvatski Kalendar (1954), p. 121.
12. See Zbornik Marka Marulića 1450-1950 (Zagreb, 1950); Mihovil Kombol, Povijest hrvatske književnosti do narodnog preporoda (Zagreb, 1945), pp. 76-87; Slavko Ježić, Hrvatska književnost

(Zagreb, 1944), pp. 71-75; Cvito Fisković, "Prilog životopisu Marka Marulića Pečenića," in *Republika*, VI (1950), 186-204. The name of Marko Marulić is to be found in very few encyclopedias, either European or American. Therefore, we are especially thankful for the article by Mirko Usmiani, in *Harvard Slavic Studies*, III (1957), 1-48, which is devoted entirely to the biography of Marko Marulić.

13. Cf. Josip Badalić, in *Zbornik Marka Marulića*, pp. 321-323, 328-331.

14. Some of his other Latin books, listed in order of their importance, are the following: *Evangelistarium* (Venice, 1516); *Quinquaginta Parabola* (Venice, 1510); *De humilitate et gloria Christi* (Venice, 1519); *Animadversio in eos qui beatum Hieronymum Italum esse contendunt* (cf. I. Lucić, *De regno Dalmatiae* [Amstelodami, 1666]). These Latin works were the reason for his glory as "fidei propugnator acerrimus, princeps suae aetatis philosophus, sacrarum litterarum scientia nemini secundus" or "post divum Hieronymum Dalmatiae secunda gloria!" Cf. Ježić, *Hrvatska književnost*, p. 71.

15. Ante Kadić, "Croatian Renaissance," *Studies in the Renaissance* (1959), p. 31.

16. Mirko Usmiani, in *Harvard Slavic Studies*, III, 1.

17. Badalić, in *Davidias*, pp. 9, 278.

18. Some other famous Croats of the same period, such as Ilija Crijević, Jakov Bunić, Juraj Šišgorić, Ivan Česmički and others are today almost forgotten because they wrote only in Latin, calling themselves Aelius Cervā, Jacobus Bona, Georgius Sisgoreus, Janus Pannonius (see Ivan Česmički, *Pjesme i epigrami* [Zagreb, 1951], pp. vii-xxii).

19. Published in Venice, 1521. It came out in three editions, within two years (see Badalić, in *Zbornik*, p. 319).

THE PROBLEM OF VOCABULARY
IN RUSSIAN TEXTS FOR BEGINNERS
(A Statistical Survey)

By Nicholas P. Vakar
Wheaton College

The growing number of Russian language texts for beginners reflects the wide divergence of opinion as to how the needs of students should be met.¹ The problem is not one of methodology; indeed, the "conversational" method seems to be universally accepted. The problem lies, rather, in certain substantive factors which seem for some reasons more prevalent in Russian language manuals than in those of other foreign languages using that method.

A comparative evaluation of foreign language texts is beyond the scope of this paper, as is an attempt to isolate and discuss the various problems facing the writer of a Russian language text for beginners. This study is confined to a description and evaluation of current Russian manuals as they relate to the problem of forming the basic vocabulary of a beginning student.

The Method of Approach

Ten Russian language texts for beginners have been examined for the first 1000 Russian words introduced, and a second set of ten texts, for the first 500 words, on the assumption that these words were chosen by the respective authors as most necessary for satisfactory communication in the Russian language. Of these twenty texts, fourteen are commonly used in the United States, one in Great Britain, one in France; three are published in Moscow for use of foreign students; and one is compiled in the U. S. S. R. for use in non-Russian Soviet schools. (References in this paper will be made by Roman numerals appropriate to the texts as listed in Appendix I.)

For each manual, each new word was placed on a separate card and numbered in the order of its appearance in the text.

For the first ten texts (I-X), the first 100 words were separated and compared, then the first 500 words, then the first 1000 words; for the controlling set of texts (XI-XX), the first 100 words were similarly treated and then the first 500 words. However, certain arbitrary decisions had to be made in order to arrange the data in as meaningful comparisons as possible. The main ones are as follows:

1. Most texts introduce "phonetic exercises" prior to Lesson I. Some of these exercises employ several hundred Russian words many of which never appear again in the text. For example, in one text (IV) which introduced 349 Russian words for phonetic exercises, only nineteen occur later in the text among the first 1000 words of the lessons. Another text (VIII) introduces 597 different words for "phonetics" and repeats only 150 of these in ensuing lessons. In similar vein, a third text (X) includes 242 words of exclusively foreign origin for its "reading exercises." It is not always clear whether students are expected to memorize that special vocabulary in order to make sure that they will articulate Russian sounds correctly, or can forget all about it as soon as the period of preliminary (?) exercises is closed. To be sure, there are texts (e.g., VI, XV, XVI, XVIII) which incorporate such phonetic exercises into the body of the lessons, and others (e.g., IX) which do not concern themselves at all with "phonetics." In the light of this variable practice, it was decided not to include words appearing in the special sections on "phonetics" in the vocabulary tabulations.

2. In the lessons, often new words are introduced in inflected forms before their dictionary form or the table of declension and conjugation are given in the text. In these cases, the inflected forms of personal pronouns, and of čto and kto, were counted as separate words. Other words were tabulated in their dictionary form whether or not that particular form appeared in the text. (Exceptions: zdravstvujte, proščajte.)

3. The individual components of phraseological units such as spokojnoj noči and kak poživaete were counted as separate words. (Exception: do svidanija.)

4. Homonyms were counted as separate words, e.g., pol—floor, pol—sex, pol—half; however, different shades of meaning or functions of a single word were not counted separately, e.g. čto, was counted once for both čto èto?

and ja znaju, čto on doma; klass was counted once for both "classroom" and "social class"; etc.

5. The aspect forms of verbs were counted as separate words, e.g. polučat' and polučit'.

6. Adverbs derived from nouns or adjectives were counted separately from the root form, e.g., utro and utrom, grustnyj and grustno.

The First 1000 Words

In the first 1000 Russian words tabulated from the ten selected texts only 97 words appeared in common. Closer analysis revealed that often a word used in the first hundred words in one text did not appear until the last hundred in another text. In fact, the ten texts contained only 23 words in common among the first 500 words, and 7 among the first 100 words—a, gde, da, i, kto, čto, eto. (The number would probably have been ten instead of seven if the Soviet textbook [IX] which does not use ne, net, and tam in the first 100 words had been replaced by a textbook published in the West.) The statistical survey also revealed that in the first 1000 words counted the ten separate texts introduced a total of 3753 different words. Several interesting factors appeared in the analysis of these words.

Of the 3753 total, 353 words are proper names (275 personal and 79 geographical) ranging from Svjatoslav to Fominična, and from Baxčisaraj to Dnepropetrovsk. More than one-half of the total number introduced appear in only one text out of ten.

Proper names found in only one text out of ten:

Texts:	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	Total
<hr/>											
Personal											
names:	2	18	8	1	9	1	83	7	24	7	160
Geographic											
names:	5	1	-	-	2	-	5	-	1	10	24
	<hr/>										
	7	19	8	1	11	1	88	7	25	17	184

Curiously, of the total 353 proper names appearing in the texts only 6 personal names and 8 geographical names were chosen by the majority of the authors:

Texts		Texts	
Ivan	8	Moskva	9
Aleksandr	6	Amerika	8
Marija	6	Rossija	8
Petr	6	Leningrad	7
Sergej	6	London	7
Smit	6	Anglija	6
		Kavkaz	6
		Francija	6

Five texts coincided in the use of 14 other names; four texts coincided in the use of 17 further names; and so on.

Another interesting factor revealed in that of the 3753 different words used, as many as 1707 are individual choices not made by the other authors. Such selections or "chance words," as they may be described, make up from 5.3 to 37.5 percent of the words employed by the authors. They are distributed as follows:

Words considered basic in one text, and ignored in all others:

Texts:	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	Total
Words:	119	177	203	246	70	375	235	100	53	129	1707

We have no generally accepted standard by which to judge the merits of word selection in one textbook as over against another. There is, of course, H. H. Josselson's Russian Word Count (1953), which includes six lists of words of different frequencies in Russian usage, but it seems that none of the authors of the texts at hand followed his work. As compared to the vocabularies in French, Spanish, and German language texts for beginners which contain often more than 80 per cent of the respective word counts by Vander Beke, Buchanan, and Morgan, the Russian language texts contain only 30 to 40 percent of the words in Josselson's high frequency lists. The correlation is especially low in the first 100 Russian words.

The first 100 Russian words in language texts include:	Words in Josselson's	
	List #1	List #2
	(first 204 w.) (next 490 w.)	

I	42	15
II	41	23
III	38	15
IV	32	14
V	40	56
VI	45	14
VII	54	17
VIII	31	15
IX	23	11
X	35	4

The table shows that only 11 to 25 percent of the words in Josselson's List No. 1 are included in the first 100 words of the Russian language texts. Indeed, it appears that the texts compilers are dependent solely on their own linguistic habits and views in solving the problem of building the vocabulary of beginning language students. The result is that the growing number of texts is producing a corresponding increase in variety of the words considered to be "necessary" and "useful" for students of Russian.

The First 500 Words

The set of control texts (XI-XX) so closely parallels the original set (I-X) that it was deemed unnecessary to continue the word count beyond the first 500 words. In the tabulation based on all twenty texts considered as a single unit a sharp decline appeared in the total number of words used in common: In the first 500 words the twenty texts had only eleven words in common, and in the first 100 words there were no words in common.

The following chart shows that again the number of proper names which appeared in the basic vocabulary is disproportionate between the texts: It varies from a text (XVIII) which uses only one proper name to a text (VII) which includes 141 different proper names in its basic vocabulary of 500 words. The mean is 38 proper names; the median, 35 proper names.

Proper Names Included in the First 500 Words

Texts	Personal Names	Geographical Names	Total
I	32	-	32
II	35	13	48
III	22	18	40
IV	4	4	8
V	29	7	36
VI	14	3	17
VII	122	19	141
VIII	14	7	21
IX	20	-	20
X	7	31	38
XI	20	2	22
XII	26	8	34
XIII	16	1	17
XIV	10	10	20
XV	13	10	23
XVI	45	26	71
XVII	44	42	86
XVIII	-	1	1
XIX	23	25	48
XX	34	10	44

It is possible that some authors of the texts do not consider proper names as vocabulary words, although it is most unlikely that students struggling through their texts would agree. It is more probable that underlying the selection of proper names for the basic vocabulary is the theory that such words (as well as Russian words of foreign origin) are easier to learn and help the student feel familiar with things Russian. Whatever the theory, this writer has often observed that it is not much easier for the American student to learn to pronounce and spell Vašington and Evropa, or Džon and Smit, than it was to learn most Russian words directly; and some students found kislrod, vodorod and poezdka, easier to pronounce and memorize than alluminij, koefficiënt or èkskur-sija.

To be sure, proper names are necessary and helpful, but on the basis of the statistics compiled here it seems that students are showered with them at the sacrifice of many other words which would be more essential in a basic vocabulary.

With the vocabulary limited to 500 basic words, the tabulations again reveal a high number of "chance words," i.e., words peculiar to only one textbook.

Number of Words Appearing in Only One Book out of Twenty:

I - 31	VI - 168	XI - 43	XVI - 20
II - 55	VII - 53	XII - 81	XVII - 71
III - 81	VIII - 40	XIII - 45	XVIII - 103
IV - 100	IX - 20	XIV - 125	XIX - 48
V - 21	X - 46	XV - 85	XX - 61

The total number of "chance words" is 1279; the mean is 65; the median, 54. Vocabulary appearing in one text in common with that in the remainder of the texts is sometimes cut as much as one-third (VI) and, in comparison with the vocabulary in any other single text, would surely be extremely low. It would seem that students learning the first 500 words from different Russian language textbooks might not be able to communicate at all with each other in Russian.

Disharmony and Agreement

Five hundred words is a lot in any language. British fishermen are said to get along with only 300 words. Is it not possible that, in studying Russian, the learning process can be facilitated by more careful and consistent selection of the first words students are to learn? Or is a basic Russian vocabulary for beginners altogether unfeasible?

The compilers of Russian language textbooks deserve understanding rather than censure. There is no established model to serve them. Foreign texts, however faithfully imitated, cannot satisfactorily solve problems peculiar to the study of Russian. Furthermore, Russian, a highly inflected language, requires few service words and consequently its vocabulary moves toward specialization at a much earlier stage than French, Spanish, German, or English. Close analysis of Josselson's List No. 1 reveals that only about 60 percent of his two hundred "high frequency" words would be common to all types of discourse. This is also the case in the twenty texts examined here, where specializations in "colloquial" Russian appeared well before the word count had reached the first hundred. Examples chosen at

random of words included in the first hundred are, on the one hand, vožd', znamja, pulemet (IX); gosudarstvo, komunist, tovarišč (VIII); zavod, institut (XV); vaxta, gudok, stanok (XVI); sovetskij, socialističeskij (III); on the other hand, ferma, prezident (X); kniga, urok, tetradka (VII); ruľ, firma (I); kapitan, oficer, furažka (XIX); bufet, komod, kuxnja (XX); sem'ja, roždestvo (XIV); even bordo, kon'jak (XI).

The text compiler who is at home in Russian cannot help but follow his personal feelings about what is necessary, useful, or simply "colloquial" in real and imaginary situations. His decisions, however subjective they may seem to us, are acceptable because we know it is in these ways that he would successfully cope with such situations himself. The task, therefore, is not to establish an absolute standard mandatory upon all, but rather to detect those elements in linguistic habits of more or less general consensus, which would serve as a preliminary guide. In this writer's view, statistics derived from the word count of the twenty texts for beginners do reveal some pattern useful for a common primary vocabulary.

Examination of the 15,000 words making up basic vocabularies in the twenty texts for beginners shows that there are in common:

eleven words in all 20 texts—а, вот, где, знать, как, кто, не, нет, что, это, я

eleven words in 19 texts—вы, говорить, да, и, мы, на, он, она, они, там, тоже

sixteen words in 18 texts—в, два, делать, быть, еще, идти, меня, мой, окно, очень, письмо, работать, сегодня, стол, теперь, хорошо

twenty-two words in 17 texts—автомобиль, брат, быть (2), ваш, город, день, дом, друг, его, ехать, здесь, или, книга, комната, один, перо, писать, по-русски, ты, уже, читать, этот

twenty-three words in 16 texts—вас, газета, дома, жена, жить, какой, карандаш, когда, куда, мать, много, наш, понимать, по-английски, русский, с, сестра, спасибо, стул, товарищ, три, у, четыре

fourteen words in 15 texts—БОЛЬШОЙ, ВИДЕТЬ, ВСЁ, ДОМОЙ, МАГАЗИН, НОВЫЙ, ОТЕЦ, ПОЖАЛУЙСТА, СЛОВО, СЫН, УРОК, ХОТЕТЬ, ЧАСТО, ШКОЛА

For practical purposes—at least in terms of elementary Russian—the total number of these words (97) may well be considered as the most commonly used “first 100 words.” Although in the selected texts these words are spread from the first to the last hundred of the words counted, compilers of new manuals should not find it difficult to organize their first lessons around this word-list rather than around vocabulary chosen strictly on their own. This list of words considered “basic” by fifteen authors out of twenty is given in alphabetical order in Appendix II.

Sixty-nine of these words are found in Josselson's List No. 1—a figure far higher than the highest number from the first 100 words in any of the twenty texts—and fourteen are found in List No. 2. Of the remaining fourteen words not located in either of these lists, only eight suggest a specialization natural to textbooks used in our schools: avtomobil', karandaš, magazin, pero, po-anglijski, po-russki, urok, škola: (None of these occur among the first 200 words in Soviet text IX.) The other six—doma, kuda, požalujsta, sestra, spasibo, stul—are common enough by any standard.

In this same manner, continuing the collection of words down to the level of coincidence in ten different texts, a list of 252 words can be added to the ninety-seven already garnered. Altogether we will have, then, a list of 350 words which may well serve as the nearest approximate to a basic Russian vocabulary. This list is given in Appendix III, organized for convenience under parts of speech.

A comparison of the words of higher (97) and lower (252) range shows that the number of nouns has increased by 80 percent, the number of verbs by 74 percent, the number of adjectives by 83 percent, and the number of adverbs by 72 percent. In contrast, the number of service words has increased 55 per cent, which suggests that the trend toward specialization develops soon after the first 100 words. This is further confirmed when we collect and analyze the words common to ten texts, then nine texts, the eight texts, and so on down to five; the total listing will be then 729 words, but the increase of service words will be only 6.4 percent.

It seems evident that the common "basic vocabulary" need not be, even cannot be, any larger than 300 to 400 words. The "350 word-list" here presented includes 90 service words, 126 nouns, 54 verbs, 18 adjectives, and 60 adverbs. The vocabulary is sufficiently large for class exercises and, indeed, for intelligent conversation. It is certainly sufficient to assist the beginning student in understanding and mastering the basic mechanism of the Russian language without burdening him with hundreds of random-chosen words which he would rarely have the chance to use again. In the absence of a better guide, it may save much time and effort for teacher and student by providing a more uniform base for our first language texts.

Appendix I

Russian Language Texts for Beginners

Examined for the first 1000 Russian words:

- I. William S. Cornyn, Beginning Russian (Yale University Press, 1950). 35 lessons. 310 pp.
- II. Rebecca A. Domar, Basic Russian (New York, 1958; mimeographed). 53 lessons. 488 pp.
- III. Mischa H. Fayer, Aron Pressman and A. F. Pressman, Simplified Russian Grammar (Pitman, 1957). 40 lessons. 408 pp.
- IV. Nevil Forbes, Elementary Russian Grammar. 2nd edition, revised by Elizabeth Hill (Clarendon Press, 1944). 24 lessons. 174 pp.
- V. André von Gronicka and Helen Bates-Yakobson, Essentials of Russian, 3rd edition (Prentice-Hall, 1958). 30 lessons. 397 pp.
- VI. I. M. Lesnin and Luba Petrova, Spoken Russian; Henry Holt Spoken Language Series. Identical with the edition prepared for the U.S. Armed Forces Institute (Henry Holt, 1945).
- VII. Horace G. Lunt, Fundamentals of Russian (W. W. Norton, 1958). 22 + 9 lessons. 320 pp.
- VIII. Nina Potapova, Russian. Textbook of the Russian Language for English-Speaking People, Part I (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1945). 43 + 9 lessons. 311 pp.
- IX. F. F. Sovetkin, Učebnik russkogo jazyka dlja molodeži ne vla-dejuščej russkim jazykom (Moscow, 1954). 45 lessons. 208 pp.

X. George A. Znamensky, Conversational Russian: A Beginner's Manual (Ginn, 1948). 25 lessons. 300 pp.

Examined for the first 500 Russian words:

XI. A. Chfel, Le russe sans peine; aperçu grammatical par Mme N. Tomiloff (Paris, 1956). 100 lessons. 419 pp.

XII. Mischa H. Fayer, Basic Russian (Pitman, 1959). 28 units. 294 pp.

XIII. Thaïs S. Lindstrom, Manual of Beginning Russian (American Book Company, 1959). 30 units. 152 pp.

XIV. Helen Michailoff, Listen and Learn Russian; records and text (Dover Publications, 1958).

XV. Moscow Radio, Learn Russian; lessons broadcast on English-language wavelengths, published by "Soviet Weekly," London, 1959-1960.

XVI. Nina Potapova, Russian: Elementary Course, Book I (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1959). 42 lessons. 360 pp.

XVII. Aron Pressman, Russian: A Living Language Conversational Manual (Crown Publishers, 1958). 40 lessons. Records and text.

XVIII. N. C. Stepanoff, Say It in Russian, 3rd revised edition (Dover Publications, 1960). 175 pp.

XIX. U. S. Army Language School, Presidio of Monterey, California. Russian Basic Course, previously entitled "Comprehensive Course in Russian"; reprinted, 1955.

XX. Helen B. Yakobson, Beginners Book in Russian (Washington, D. C.: Educational Services, 1959). 124 pp.

Appendix II: "First 100 Words" in Alphabetical Order (see above, page 27)

а	где	ежать	книга
автомобиль	говорить	еще	когда
	город		комната
большой		жена	кто
брат	да	жить	куда
быть	два		
	делать	здесь	магазин
в	день	знать	мать
вас	дом		меня
ваш	дома	и	много
видеть	домой	идти	мой
вот	друг	или	мы
все			
вы		как	
	его	какой	на
газета	есть(быть)	карандаш	наш

не	письмо	стол	хорошо
нет	по-английски	стул	хотеть
новый	по-русски	сын	
	пожалуйста		часто
один	понимать	там	четыре
окно		теперь	читать
он	работать	товарищ	что
она	русский	тоже	
они		три	школа
отец	с	ты	
очень	сегодня		это
	сестра	у	этот
перо	слово	уже	
писать	спасибо	урок	я

Appendix III: Basic 350 Words
(see above, page 27)

[The figure to the right of each word indicates the number of texts in which that word appeared among the first five hundred.]

автобус	11	дочь	14	неделя	12
автомобиль	17	друг	18	ночь	14
американец	11	жена	17	обед	14
библиотека	12	журнал	14	окно	19
билет	11	завтрак	12	осень	12
брат	20	здание	13	отец	16
бумага	14	зима	15	пальто	14
весна	13	имя	13	парк	13
вечер	16	карандаш	16	перо	17
вещь	13	карта	14	письмо	19
вода	16	картина	11	погода	13
вокзал	13	квартира	13	поезд	14
вопрос	14	кино	11	поле	14
воскресенье	11	класс	15	профессор	11
время	15	книга	17	пятница	11
газета	16	комната	19	работа	14
год	14	концерт	11	радио	11
голова	12	кофе	14	раз	13
город	18	кресло	12	река	14
господин	13	лампа	15	ресторан	15
госпожа	11	лес	12	рука	15
гражданин	12	лето	16	сад	12
гражданка	11	люди	11	самолет	11
дверь	16	магазин	16	сахар	12
девушка	13	мальчик	13	семья	14
дело	14	масло	16	сестра	19
день	19	мать	18	слово	16
деньги	15	место	14	снег	14
деревня	16	месяц	11	стена	15
дети	15	минута	11	стол	18
диван	11	молоко	14	студент	14
дождь	11	море	11	студентка	11
доктор	12	мост	11	стул	19
дом	18	муж	15	суп	15
дорога	14	мясо	13	сын	16

сыр	12	урок	16	чай	15
театр	12	утро	16	час	16
телефон	11	ученик	12	чашка	11
товарищ	17	учитель	15	человек	13
трамвай	12	учительница	12	школа	19
улица	18	фамилия	12	экзамен	11
университет	11	хлеб	16	язык	15

* * * *

брать	13	играть	14	понимать	17
быть	19	идти	18	приехать	12
видеть	18	класть	11	приходить	12
говорить	20	купить	12	работать	18
гулять	13	лежать	16	садиться	11
давать	13	любить	17	сделать	11
дать	13	мочь	17	сидеть	12
делать	18	написать	12	сказать	14
думать	14	нравиться	11	слушать	14
ездить	12	обедать	12	смотреть	13
есть (быть)	19	отвечать	15	спать	11
есть (еда)	14	отдыхать	11	спрашивать	15
ехать	17	писать	18	стоять	15
жить	17	пить	15	ужинать	12
забыть	11	поживать	13	учить	11
завтракать	13	пойти	12	ходить	12
здравствуйте	14	показать	11	хотеть	19
знать	20	помнить	12	читать	19

* * * *

белый	11	интересный	11	плохой	14
большой	18	красивый	15	русский	18
добрый	14	красный	13	синий	12
должен	13	маленький	14	старый	12
дорогой	11	молодой	12	хороший	15
другой	11	новый	17	черный	13

* * * *

быстро	13	летом	13	поздно	12
весной	11	лучше	14	потом	15
вечером	16	мало	13	рано	12
вместе	12	медленно	14	сегодня	19
всегда	14	много	17	сейчас	16
вчера	14	можно	14	сколько	16
давно	11	надо	13	скоро	15
далеко	12	налево	14	спасибо	17
днем	14	направо	14	сидя	12
до свиданья	15	немного	12	там	19
дома	16	никогда	11	теперь	19
домой	15	ничего	16	тепло	11
еще	18	нужно	13	тоже	19
жаль	12	опять	12	только	17
жарко	13	осенью	12	туда	14
завтра	16	очень	19	уже	18
здесь	17	пешком	11	утром	16
зимой	12	по-английски	17	холодно	14
иногда	14	по-русски	17	хорошо	20
конечно	12	пожалуйста	15	часто	15

* * * *

один	19	пять	15	девять	13
два	19	шесть	13	десять	14
три	17	семь	13	двенадцать	11
четыре	17	восемь	12	двадцать	12
первый	16	четвертый	11	седьмой	11
второй	15	пятый	11	восьмой	11
третий	15	шестой	11	десятый	12

* * * *

я	20	он	19	мы	20
меня	18	она	19	нам	11
мне	15	они	19	нас	15
ты	17	оно	12	вы	20
мой	20	его	18	вас	16
твой	13	ее	15	наш	19
свой	12	их	14	ваш	18
себя	11				

* * * *

весь	15	кто	20	чей	14
все	13	который	12	что	20
всё	18	такой	12	это	20
какой	18	тот	14	этот	19

* * * *

а	20	и	19	но	14
без	15	из	13	ну	11
в	19	или	18	о	15
вот	20	к	16	около	12
где	20	как	20	от	17
да	19	когда	17	по	16
для	16	куда	17	после	13
до	15	ли	13	потому что	14
же	12	на	20	почему	17
за	16	не	20	с	18
		нет	20	так	15
				у	16
				через	13

Note

1. Acknowledgement is due the Wheaton Committee on Advanced and Special Studies and the Danford Foundation for grants to defray clerical and some other expenses involved in the preparation of this paper.

OBSERVATIONS OF LANGUAGE TEACHING IN THE SOVIET UNION

By Symond Yavener

Indiana University

This article was written as the result of observations made during the 1959-60 academic year while the author was participating in the exchange program between the United States and the Soviet Union. The purpose of my year of study at Moscow State University was almost purely linguistic in nature, namely to acquire enough Russian and to learn as much as possible about the country in order to teach high school Russian effectively. In the program there were four American secondary school teachers, who undertook an intensive and concentrated study of the Russian language. From the very start these teachers expressed considerable interest in extending their objectives to a consideration of the problem of foreign language instruction in Soviet schools. However, Soviet authorities showed little enthusiasm in permitting these four American foreign language specialists to look at their nation's schools in operation. Although we arrived in September 1959, final official sanction of school visitations was received only in May 1960, after countless requests had been submitted throughout the year. Nevertheless, I was fortunate in making the acquaintance of a number of language teachers who permitted me to visit schools. In this way I was able to speak with a number of people concerned with the language teaching profession. The purpose of this article is to share some of these observations on language study in the Soviet Union. Specifically, the problem of language teacher preparation as well as this writer's observations of the state of foreign language instruction in Soviet schools will be discussed.

What are the possibilities for training language teachers in the Soviet Union? There appear to be three: the university, the pedagogical institutes, and institutes of foreign languages. During the year several visits to such institutions were made

possible, and one was able to talk with a great many people associated with them. The four American teachers were themselves enrolled at the kafedra of Russian Language for Non-Russian Students of the Humanities, an independently operated kafedra, formerly a branch of the philological faculty of Moscow State University.

After a very short time at Moscow University it became very obvious that, in general, the university is not concerned with training language teachers for the secondary schools as are other institutions of higher learning. Much as in the American university, there is considerable less attention given to pedagogical procedures and much more to scholarly pursuits. Here the teaching of language seems to fulfill two main objectives: one, to produce future teachers of literature and linguistics; the other, considerably more prosaic and involving many more people, i. e., the to present instruction of undergraduates for fulfilling language requirements. It is interesting to note that frequently the most effective teachers of these latter required courses are themselves products of a foreign language institute. One saw no evidence of these undergraduate university courses offering anything spectacular in approaches or results in language teaching. The course in the majority of cases represented a pedestrian approach, with students being virtually shackled by endless translations and memorization of grammatical rules. The texts, other than being highly political in nature, more closely resembled a grammatical catalogue than any approach to living language. At best these undergraduate courses enable the student to obtain some reading knowledge, for it is rare to find students of such courses capable of handling effectively any other aspect of the foreign language. In the departments of Western European languages it was impossible to find anything at Moscow State University resembling a well-equipped language laboratory. From all observation it appears that the nearest thing to such mechanical aids was a room containing several tape recorders and illustrations demonstrating speech organs in the process of producing sounds in the language concerned. This observation is not true, however, of the Far Eastern and African Language Division at Moscow State University, which is much better equipped to have more effective language instruction.

One is occasionally dismayed at the reports brought home by visitors of Soviet universities on the number of people

using English so effectively. It appears that such exciting findings are inversely proportional to the length of one's stay.

Although many public school foreign language teachers receive their training at the university, it is obvious the pedagogical institutes and foreign language institutes play a much greater role. One such organization is the Lenin Pedagogical Institute, which our group was permitted to visit on several occasions. After talking with a number of its staff members and students, one was greatly impressed by the spirit of direction and consciousness of its goals. As the name implies, considerable attention is devoted to matters of professional education, yet subject matter is by no means neglected. The philosophy motivating the methodology practiced by this school is one whereby language instruction is rendered dynamic and practical. To assist in the revitalization of language teaching the Lenin Institute can boast of an admirable language laboratory with a number of listening positions. Yet this number was restricted by the use of enclosed booths requiring more space than the cubicles so common in American language laboratories. Although the booths provide a somewhat greater degree of privacy, the more extensive use of the facilities is consequently restricted. One was even more greatly impressed by the facilities at the Lenin Pedagogical Institute after finding little evidence of such language laboratory equipment at the university. At this pedagogical institute and, one can assume, in most such organizations of this type in the Soviet Union, as student chooses a major and minor language. It is required that he have several years of the major language before entry. It was pointed out that the inequality of students' backgrounds was of considerable concern to the staff, for apparently, as in our own country, there are educationally more backward areas. (This was a frequent topic of conversation with students at the university, who often indicated that the quality of teaching lowers in many cases as one leaves the area around the bigger cities.) As are most VUZ's, this too is a five-year institute. Upon beginning the third year a student commences his second language. Work includes grammar, phonetics, general linguistics, Latin, literature, and area courses. This is combined with work in the active use of the language carried on simultaneously throughout the five years. As in all Soviet institutions of higher learning, students are

required to enroll in inevitable courses in political matters, upon which they receive very comprehensive examinations, along with those in subject matter courses at the end of their study. In the third year, methods courses are begun, and not until the fourth year does a student embark on practice teaching. A greater proportion of time is spent in public schools during the final year of study at the pedagogical institute.

However, the language training institute having the greatest prestige plus, apparently, the most outstanding results is the Moscow Institute of Foreign Languages. When our tourists return full of praise for "all the Russians who speak fluent English" it is very likely that they have been in contact with students or graduates of this school. The Institute of Foreign Languages is a very large organization training people for a variety of positions requiring a knowledge of languages. Needless to say, the four American teachers were not given an opportunity to view the entire institute in action. One felt indeed fortunate in gaining access to the pedagogical branch of the English Language Division.

The director places this school between the pedagogical institute and the university, for it was pointed out that here there is much greater emphasis on subject matter. Yet a consideration of the five-year study program seems to indicate only slightly less work done in professional education than in the above-mentioned pedagogical institute. Apparently the great success of this school rests in the intensity of the course work as well as the quality of the student accepted. Because of the school's fine reputation and high prestige, admission requirements are very rigid. The dean indicated that for every opening there are at least ten applicants. A consideration of the program of study should serve to give the reader a better idea of the education received by future language teachers here. The program is divided into four headings or cycles: the pedagogical cycle, the general cycle, the political, and the special or language cycle.

The most interesting aspect of the pedagogical cycle is the requirement that all students work elsewhere before finally deciding to devote themselves to teaching. They are given an opportunity to work at conferences, to gain summer employment with Intourist, or perhaps to do translations with the Foreign Language Publishing House. They must spend three weeks working at a Pioneer camp to test their desire to devote themselves to working with young people. As the name implies,

this cycle involves a number of education courses including periodical observations of public school classes, five weeks of practice teaching in the fourth year, with even more independent teaching carried out in the course of the final year.

One might liken the general cycle to area work which attempts to encompass all aspects of the life, history, and literature of the country involved. Latin has maintained a place here in the preparation of linguists, for as part of this cycle courses in both Latin and general linguistics are required. This heading also embraces work in Russian language and literature, as well as physical training.

The political training here is much as that in other Soviet VUZ's with courses in History of the U.S.S.R. and its Communist Party, political economics, and historical and dialectical materialism.

Of main concern for the preparation of a teacher capable of using the language is the Special or Language Cycle, which attempts to immerse each student in as much of the language as possible during the course of study. Without going into detail, here is a list of subjects which occupy the greatest block of a student's time at this institute: phonetics, conversation, translation, lexicology, stylistics, history of the language, theoretical and comparative grammar.

Even this important organization has not escaped the greatest difficulty harassing everyone in the Soviet Union, the housing shortage. The English Language Division is housed in an old building located on the outskirts of Moscow. Yet, in spite of this difficulty, every inch of area is used advantageously. As in the less congested Lenin Institute, this organization also boasts of good language laboratory facilities. The author was greatly impressed by the complete tape library covering every aspect of Anglo-American speech. Although the laboratory equipment lacks the refinement of American material, there seemed to be little doubt about its efficacy. This is indeed borne out in the final test of any educational institution—the quality of the students trained. Of course there are many exceptions, but one is very greatly impressed by the high degree of ability with which most graduates handle the language.

Since my return to the United States I have learned from the press that major changes have been made at the above institutes. Apparently throughout the Soviet Union pedagogical

institutes are undergoing reorganization with the introduction of new curriculums. Sources indicate that the pedagogical section of the Institute of Foreign Languages has been taken away from the latter organization and become officially a part of the Lenin Pedagogical Institute. This is just another indication of the changes taking place daily in Soviet education.

It is worth noting that not all foreign language institutes in the Soviet Union have the quality instruction or can boast of the fine results which seem to characterize the Moscow organizations. The author's talks with graduates of various languages institutes throughout the nation clearly indicate a high degree of inequality.

Thus far this article has attempted to give the reader some idea of the training of a language teacher in the Soviet Union. Now that the teacher has emerged so often well-equipped from an institute, what becomes of him professionally? It is perhaps worth noting at this point that the most outstanding graduates are frequently encouraged to teach at a VUZ rather than in a secondary school. One would justifiably wonder why the Soviet Union isn't linguistically among the most advanced nations if so many of the country's teachers receive the training described above.

It is impossible to understand the present state of language teaching in the Soviet Union without some consideration of its history. In the past Soviet language teaching methodology has been characterized by extreme conservatism which has resulted more than once in having had a stifling effect on the study of languages.¹ Within recent years, there has been a great degree of liberalization from the deadening comparative method towards a much healthier eclectic one. Upon reading through the new program for foreign language study in the middle schools one finds it far from revolutionary, yet in the light of the past, great changes in thinking are being made. Steps are underway to free modern language teaching from the yoke of grammar for grammar's sake. Here is a section taken from the introduction of the Program of Foreign Language Study of the Middle Schools published by the Ministry of Education of the R. S. F. S. R.

The goal for the instruction of foreign languages in the secondary middle schools is to teach students to read and to understand authentic foreign texts of average difficulty with the aid of a dictionary and to lay the foundation for the use of aural speech.

The task of the teacher is that of helping the student who has mastered a definite amount of knowledge to develop practical mastery of the language.²

It is interesting to note that at least some mention of the oral use of the language is made. The author visited a class in elementary English in a Moscow school in which English was used the greater part of the time. Yet, it was used by a highly qualified teacher who insisted on well-pronounced oral translations with little or no use of structural linguistics in eventually creating fluent partially bilingual speech on the part of her student. Nevertheless, after five years of such instruction it is reasonable to assume that the students will develop an acceptable working knowledge of the language. Even such oral translation techniques are relatively new, for there are certainly few university students today who have anything more than the ability to read more than the most elementary texts. This plight is fully realized by many astute secondary school teachers in Russia today. Most of the teachers with whom the author talked during the past year showed considerable concern and a desire to improve language teaching techniques. Although the official program admits the need and importance of oral usage in teaching, it still places grammar and translation first. Many Soviet teachers are conscious of a need for more freedom, and it was indeed significant when a group of teachers presented the author with a book by B. V. Beljaev entitled Outline of the Psychology of Foreign Language Instruction.³ In his book the author presents convincing evidence that the overdose of translation has done language little good and advocates what one might well call a more aural-oral approach.

There is little doubt at this point that many of the new people entering the language teaching profession in the Soviet Union are well qualified. Certainly very few of our undergraduate majors can begin to compete with the graduates of the above-mentioned institutes. One has every reason to believe that Soviet language methodology is undergoing considerable change. Although to a shockingly high degree effective teaching is still to often restricted by over-emphasis on comparison and translation, there is much evidence of a new approach to language teaching. We, too, are cognizant of the difficulties involved in effectuating such a change. Teachers

are, alas, a conservative lot; yet Soviet educators are experimenting. For several years schools have already existed in which foreign language instruction is carried on in almost all subjects from the most elementary grades through the tenth. As a student at Moscow University one still sees little evidence of great strides in languages. Yet, if the present emphasis on language teaching continues, one can have every reason to foresee more effective use of foreign speech on all levels in the not too-distant-future. It is hoped that American educators will become more conscious of Soviet languages advances and make an even greater attempt to improve the quality of language instruction in the United States.

Notes

1. For more detailed information on the history of Soviet language teaching, see Abraham Kreusler, "Soviet Modern Language Reform," SEEJ, n. s., III (1959), 160-168.

2. Programmy srednej školy na 1958-59 učebnyj god: Inostrannie jazyki (Moskva, 1958).

3. B. V. Beljaev, Očerki po psixologii obučenija inostrannym jazykam (Moskva, 1959).

HIGH SCHOOL RUSSIAN: NO ENGLISH FROM THE FIRST DAY, PART I

By Wayne D. Fisher

Canton Senior High School, Canton, Ill.

Unbelievable as it may seem, it is possible, yea desirable, that English be rendered inactive from the first day of instruction in the teaching of high school Russian.¹ There is considerable misunderstanding, however, as to just what this means.

Perhaps one quick way of getting at what is meant would be to state precisely what is not meant.

The instructor does not stand before his class the first day and babble on and on in Russian while his frustrated students wish they had signed up for Coed Cooking instead. The instructor does not expect his students to be able to compose "free conversation" at the outset. The student is not permitted to ramble around in atrocious Russian with incorrect structure and unacceptable phonation.

In the first instruction period this is what can and should take place:

The instructor can use only Russian, with absolutely no English comment;

The student can understand every word spoken;

The student himself will speak only Russian, with startlingly accurate phonation, and will understand what he is saying;

The instructor will speak Russian about sixty per cent of the class time;

The students will speak Russian the remaining forty per cent of the class time;

The instructor will carry on two-way exchanges in Russian between himself and individual students;

The instructor will direct two-way exchanges between two students in Russian;

Neither the instructor nor the students will feel any need whatsoever for resorting to English.

This is unbelievable only to those who have not ventured such an approach in their classrooms. There is no frustration

for students; on the contrary, there is great eagerness to be able to manipulate more and more of the language. Students and instructor alike come to feel that any English in the classroom is a waste of time.

At the end of this article there appears an abbreviated form of a suggested lesson plan for the first day of instruction in a beginning class of high school Russian. This particular plan was developed to accompany Fayer, Pressman, and Pressman, Simplified Russian Grammar (Pitman Publishing Co., New York, 1957), but a similar plan could easily be developed to accompany any textbook. It is requisite that lesson plans developed for the prereading phase be based upon the textbook which will eventually be used. Students then learn to read the same materials they have already learned to control orally.

Some critics of the aural-oral approach to the teaching of Russian complain that the reading-writing skills are neglected. This is part of the misunderstanding which needs to be cleared up. The aural-oral approach merely restores language teaching to a balanced four-point approach: listening comprehension, oral expression, reading, and writing. "Balanced," however, need not refer to "equal" stress. In no language on earth is there an equal balance of these four skills. "Balance," therefore, refers to proportions in the realistic use of language. A naturally balanced approach toward the teaching of Russian, then, would give stress to the four skills, all of which are taught, in the following rank of importance: listening comprehension, oral expression, reading, and writing.

The mission of the prereading phase of instruction is a restorative one. (See U.S. Office of Education Circular No. 583: Modern Foreign Languages in the Secondary School: Prereading Instruction, prepared by Dr. Patricia O'Connor under NDEA. It treats adequately the subject of devices and techniques used in the aural-oral approach.) It restores to language the proper stress on listening comprehension and oral expression. Students on the high school level in other subject areas come to regard reading and writing as paramount academic skills in their native English. There is a tendency on the part of both students and instructors in a beginning language course to adopt the same regard for reading and writing at the outset of the study of a language. Certainly no one denies their importance. And the further a person goes

in his pursuit of Russian, the more important become the reading and writing skills. But the fact remains that in terms of language as communication, rather than language as academic discipline, the first stages of development deal with aural-oral skills. Any approach which perverts this natural order is artificial, to say the least, though for some special purposes (scientific reading knowledge, for example) there is no reason it cannot be done.

The poorest reason usually given for stressing reading and writing at the outset is that this is what teachers at advanced levels of learning want and expect of the students who come to them. Is it justifiable to study a language for the teacher's sake, or for the schools's sake, rather than for the student's own sake of wanting the pleasure and thrill of gaining a sense of ease and comfort in a second language?

How can "no English from the first day" be implemented?

In many high schools, a short class schedule is followed on the first day of school. If this is the case, this fifteen- or twenty-minute period is an ideal length for the orientation of the beginning class. This time can be taken to explain something of the nature of language as revealed by modern scientific descriptive linguistics. The instructor can point out areas in which English phonation is likely to interfere with Russian phonation. Classroom procedures to be followed in subsequent sessions can be explained. And the reasons for rendering English inactive in the beginning Russian classroom should be made clear. This, needless to say, is accomplished in English. From that session on, however, it should be emphasized that the student will no longer use English in the Russian classroom, although he should be told that on rare occasions the instructor may resort to English very briefly to simplify a situation and may end the Russian class a few minutes early from time to time to permit questions, discussion, or explanations in English. Then, on the first full teaching day, the Russian class is conducted wholly in Russian, to the delight of all concerned.

During early stages of learning Russian there is no need whatsoever to criticize the student's performance. He is only to be encouraged, stimulated, helped, and appreciated. He will be his own toughest critic. The instructor will have to reassure him constantly that he is doing better than he realizes, and this is true.

5. Repeat step #4, but with individual students responding.

- | | | |
|----|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 6. | UČITEL' | STUDENTY |
| | Èto karandaš? | Èto karandaš? |
| | Net, èto ne karandaš,
a pero. | Net, èto ne karandaš,
a pero. |
| | Èto bumaga? | Èto bumaga? |
| | Net, èto ne bumaga,
a kniga. | Net, èto ne bumaga,
a kniga. |

(continue with same vocabulary items as before.)

7. UČITEL' STUDENTY
Repeat step #6, but with individual students responding.

- | | | |
|----|---------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 8. | UČITEL' | STUDENTY |
| | Sprosite ego, čto èto. | 1. Čto èto? |
| | | 2. Èto karandaš. |
| | Sprosite eë, èto pero. | 1. Èto pero? |
| | | 2. Da, èto pero. |
| | Sprosite ego, èto bumaga. | 1. Èto bumaga? |
| | | 2. Net, èto ne bumaga,
a kniga. |
| | Sprosite eë, čto èto. | 1. Čto èto? |
| | | 2. Èto gazeta. |

(continue with same vocabulary items as before.)

Russkaja lenta No. 1

(Laboratorija jazykov)

1. Èto kniga? Da, èto kniga. Net, èto ne kniga.
2. Èto pero? Da, èto pero. Net, èto ne pero.
3. Èto gazeta? Da, èto gazeta. Net, èto ne gazeta.

(continue, using same vocabulary items as before.)

Note

1. This paper is an extension of an address delivered before the Modern Language Section of the convention of the Indiana State Teachers Association in Indianapolis, on October 28, 1960. Part II will give suggestions on what to do after the first day.

A TENTATIVE LIST OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES OFFERING RUSSIAN, FALL 1960

By Ilo Remer and June Barlow

U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

The number of colleges and universities offering Russian language instruction has grown spectacularly in the post-sputnik era. We have every right to expect that this increase will continue because of public interest and our demonstrated needs for Russian language and area competencies. The difference in only one year can be seen by comparing the summary table for 1959-60 with that of 1960-61. Included in the compilation are colleges, universities, and junior colleges with offerings in their regular programs. Excluded are extension and adult education programs and televised courses.

Sources for the original compilation published in the Spring 1960 issue of this Journal were existing lists, State foreign language newsletters, professional journals, other periodicals, correspondence, and college and university catalogs. The 1960-61 list incorporates, in addition, information available from the Modern Language Association Foreign Language Program, which is conducting some formal surveys under a National Defense Education Act contract, to supply statistics on foreign language offerings at every level of instruction. Its findings for 1958 and 1959 will be released in the near future.

It must be emphasized, because of the informal nature of this list and the factor of rapid growth, that some institutions may have been inadvertently omitted. Any corrections or additions will be appreciated.

List of Institutions by State

Alabama

Auburn Univ.¹
Spring Hill Coll.
State Teachers Coll., Jacksonville
Talladega Coll.
Tuskegee Inst., Tuskegee Institute
Univ. of Ala., University

Alaska

Alas. Methodist Univ.,
Anchorage
Anchorage Community Coll.
Univ. of Alas., College

Arizona

Ariz. State Univ., Tempe
Phoenix Coll.
Univ. of Ariz., Tucson

Arkansas

Univ. of Ark., Fayetteville

California

Ambassador Coll., Pasadena
Am. Acad. of Asian Studies,
San Francisco
Antelope Valley Coll., Lancaster
Cabrillo Coll., Watsonville
Calif. Baptist Coll., Riverside
Cal. Inst. of Technology,
Pasadena
Cal. Western Univ., San Diego
Chapman Coll., Orange
Citrus Junior Coll., Azusa
City Coll. of San Francisco
Coalinga Coll.
Coll. of Notre Dame, Belmont

California (cont.)

Coll. of San Mateo
 Coll. of the Holy Names,
 Oakland
 Compton Coll.
 Contra Costa Coll., San Pablo
 Diablo Valley Coll., Concord
 East Los Angeles Coll.,
 Los Angeles
 El Camino Coll.,
 El Camino College
 Foothill Coll., Mountain View
 Fresno City Coll.
 Fresno State Coll.
 Fullerton Junior Coll.
 Hartnell Coll., Salinas
 Humboldt State Coll., Arcata
 Long Beach City Coll.
 Los Angeles City Coll.
 Los Angeles Pierce Coll.,
 Woodland Hills
 Los Angeles State Coll. of Appl.
 Arts and Sciences
 Los Angeles Valley Coll.,
 Van Nuys
 Loyola Univ. of Los Angeles
 Marymount Coll., Los Angeles
 Menlo Coll., Menlo Park
 Mills Coll., Oakland
 Modesto Junior Coll.
 Monterey Inst. of Foreign Studies,
 Carmel
 Monterey Peninsula Coll.
 Mount St. Mary's Coll.,
 Los Angeles
 Mount San Antonio Coll.,
 Pomona
 Oakland City Coll.
 Occidental Coll., Los Angeles
 Oceanside-Carlsbad Coll.,
 Oceanside
 Orange Coast Coll., Costa Mesa
 Pasadena City Coll.
 Pomona Coll., Claremont
 Sacramento City Coll.
 Sacramento State Coll.
 St. Mary's Coll. of Cal.,
 St. Mary's College
 San Bernardino Valley Coll.,
 San Bernardino
 San Diego Junior Coll.
 San Diego State Coll.

California (cont.)

San Fernando Valley State Coll.,
 Northridge
 San Francisco Coll. for Women
 San Francisco State Coll.
 San Jose State Coll.
 Santa Monica City Coll.
 Santa Rosa Junior Coll.
 Shasta Coll., Redding
 U/G² Stanford Univ.
 Stockton Coll.
 U. S. Army Language School,
 Monterey
 U/G/A Univ. of Cal., Berkeley
 Univ. of Cal., Davis
 Univ. of Cal., Los Angeles
 Univ. of Cal., Riverside
 Univ. of Cal., Santa Barbara
 Univ. of Redlands
 Univ. of San Diego
 Univ. of San Diego, College
 for Men
 Univ. of San Francisco
 U/A Univ. of S. Calif.,
 Los Angeles
 Ventura Coll.
 Westmont Coll., Santa Barbara
 Whittier Coll.

Canal Zone

Canal Zone Junior Coll.,
 Balboa Heights

Colorado

Adams State Coll., Alamosa
 Colo. State Univ., Fort Collins
 Mesa County Junior Coll.,
 Grand Junction
 Regis Coll., Denver
 U.S. Air Force Academy,
 Colorado Springs
 U/G/A Univ. of Colo., Boulder
 Univ. of Denver

Connecticut

U Conn. Coll., New London
 Danbury State Teachers Coll.
 Fairfield Univ.
 Hillyer Coll. (Univ. of Hartford)
 Quinnipiac Coll., Hamden
 St. Joseph Coll., West Hartford
 Southern Conn. State Coll.,
 New Haven

Connecticut (cont.)

Teachers Coll. of Conn.,
New Britain
Trinity Coll., Hartford
Univ. of Bridgeport
Univ. of Conn., Storrs
Univ. of Conn., Waterbury
Wesleyan Univ., Middletown
U/G/A Yale Univ., New Haven

Delaware

Univ. of Del., Newark

District of Columbia

A American Univ., Washington
Catholic Univ. of America,
Washington
Dept. of Agr. Grad. School,
Washington
Dunbarton Coll. of the Holy Cross,
Washington
G Georgetown Inst. of Languages
and Linguistics (Georgetown
Univ.), Washington
G Georgetown Univ., Washington
U George Washington Univ.,
Washington
National Bureau of Standards
Grad. School, Washington
School of Advanced International
Studies (Johns Hopkins Univ.),
Washington
Trinity Coll., Washington

Florida

Barry Coll., Miami
Daytona Beach Junior Coll.
Flor. State Univ., Tallahassee
Manatee Junior Coll., Bradenton
Pensacola Junior Coll.
Stetson Univ., De Land
U Univ. of Flor., Gainesville
U Univ. of Miami, Coral Gables
Univ. of South Flor., Tampa
Univ. of Tampa

Georgia

Armstrong Coll., Savannah
Emory Univ., Atlanta
Georgia Inst. of Tech., Atlanta
North Georgia Coll., Dahlonega
Univ. of Ga., Athens

Hawaii

Univ. of Hawaii, Honolulu

Idaho

Ida. State Coll., Pocatello
Univ. of Ida., Moscow

Illinois

Augustana Coll., Rock Island
Aurora Coll.
Bradley Univ., Peoria
Chicago City Junior Coll.
De Paul Univ., Chicago
Eastern Ill. Univ., Charleston
Ill. State Normal Univ., Normal
Ill. Inst. of Tech., Chicago
Knox Coll., Galesburg
Lake Forest Coll.
Loyola Univ., Chicago
Millikin Univ., Decatur
Monmouth Coll.
Mundelein Coll., Chicago
Northern Illinois Univ., De Kalb
Northwestern Univ., Chicago
U Northwestern Univ., Evanston
Olivet Nazarene Coll., Kankakee
Principia Coll., Elsah
Rockford Coll.
Roosevelt Univ., Chicago
Rosary Coll., River Forest
St. Procopius Coll., Lisle
St. Xavier Coll., Chicago
Shimer Coll., Mount Carroll
Shurtleff Coll., Alton
Southern Ill. Univ., Carbondale
G Univ. of Chicago
U/G/A Univ. of Ill., Urbana
Western Ill. Univ., Macomb

Indiana

Anderson Coll. and Theological
Seminary
Ball State Teachers Coll.,
Muncie
Butler Univ., Indianapolis
DePauw Univ., Greencastle
Earlham Coll., Richmond
Evansville Coll.
Franklin Coll. of Ind.
Goshen Coll.
Hanover Coll.
Ind. State Teachers Coll.,
Terre Haute
U/G/A Ind. Univ., Bloomington
Manchester Coll.,
North Manchester

Indiana (cont.)

Marian Coll., Indianapolis
 Purdue Univ., Lafayette
 Rose Polytechnic Inst.,
 Terre Haute
 St. Mary-of-the-Woods Coll.
 St. Mary's Coll., Notre Dame
 Taylor Univ., Upland
 Tri-State Coll., Angola
 A Univ. of Notre Dame
 Valparaiso Univ.
 Wabash Coll., Crawfordsville

Iowa

Coe Coll., Cedar Rapids
 U Cornell Coll., Mount Vernon
 Drake Univ., Des Moines
 Grinnell Coll.
 Iowa State Teachers Coll.,
 Cedar Falls
 Iowa State Univ. of Science,
 Ames
 Iowa Wesleyan Coll.,
 Mount Pleasant
 Marycrest Coll., Davenport
 Morningside Coll., Sioux City
 Parsons Coll., Fairfield
 St. Ambrose Coll., Davenport
 Simpson Coll., Indianola
 U/A State Univ. of Iowa,
 Iowa City
 Wartburg Coll., Waverly

Kansas

Bethel Coll., North Newton
 Kan. State Coll. of Pittsburg
 Kan. State Teachers Coll.,
 Emporia
 Kan. State Univ. of Agr. and
 App. Science, Manhattan
 Sterling Coll.
 U Univ. of Kan., Lawrence
 Univ. of Wichita
 Washburn Univ. of Topeka

Kentucky

Bellarmino Coll., Louisville
 U Univ. of Ky., Lexington
 Univ. of Louisville
 Western Ky. State Coll.,
 Bowling Green

Louisiana

Louisiana Coll., Pineville

Louisiana (cont.)

Louisiana State Univ. and Agr.
 and Mech. Coll., Baton Rouge
 La. State Univ. and Agr. and
 Mech. Coll., New Orleans
 Loyola Univ., New Orleans
 Newcomb Coll. (Tulane Univ.
 of La.), New Orleans
 Southeastern La. Coll.,
 Hammond
 Southern Univ. and Mech. Coll.,
 Baton Rouge
 Tulane Univ. of La., New Orleans
 Univ. of Southwestern La.,
 Lafayette

Maine

Bates Coll., Lewiston
 Bowdoin Coll., Brunswick
 Colby Coll., Waterville
 Univ. of Maine, Orono

Maryland

Coll. of Notre Dame of
 Maryland, Inc., Baltimore
 Goucher Coll., Baltimore
 A John Hopkins Univ., Baltimore
 Montgomery Junior Coll.,
 Takoma Park
 Morgan State Coll., Baltimore
 Mount Saint Agnes Coll.,
 Baltimore
 U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis
 Univ. of Md., College Park
 Western Md. Coll., Westminster

Massachusetts

Am. International Coll.,
 Springfield
 Amherst Coll.
 Assumption Coll., Worcester
 Atlantic Union Coll.,
 South Lancaster
 Boston Coll., Chestnut Hills
 U Boston Univ.
 Brandeis Univ., Waltham
 Clark Univ., Worcester
 Coll. of the Holy Cross,
 Worcester
 Emmanuel Coll., Boston
 U/A Harvard Univ., Cambridge
 Lesley Coll., Cambridge
 Lowell Tech. Inst.

Massachusetts (cont.)

U Mass. Inst. of Tech.,
Cambridge
U Mt. Holyoke Coll., South Hadley
Newton Coll. of the Sacred Heart
Northeastern Univ., Boston
Radcliffe Coll., Cambridge
Regis Coll., Weston
U/G Smith Coll., Northampton
State Teachers Coll. at Boston
Tufts Univ., Medford
G Univ. of Mass., Amherst
Wellesley Coll.
Wheaton Coll., Norton
Williams Coll., Williamstown

Michigan

Albion Coll.
Alma Coll.
Aquinas Coll., Grand Rapids
Eastern Mich. Univ., Ypsilanti
Hillsdale Coll.
Kalamazoo Coll.
Mich. Coll. of Mining and Tech.,
Houghton
Mich. State Univ. of Agr. and
App. Science, East Lansing
Mich. State Univ. of Agr. and
App. Science (Oakland Branch),
Rochester
Port Huron Junior Coll.
Univ. of Detroit
U/G/A Univ. of Michigan,
Ann Arbor
U/A Wayne State Univ., Detroit
Western Michigan Univ.,
Kalamazoo

Minnesota

Augsburg Coll. and Theol. Sem.,
Minneapolis
Bemidji State Coll.
Carleton Coll., Northfield
Coll. of St. Teresa, Winona
Concordia Coll., Moorhead
Gustavus Adolphus Coll.,
St. Peter
Hamline Univ., St. Paul
U Macalester Coll., St. Paul
Mankato State Coll.
St. Mary's Coll., Winona
St. Olaf Coll., Northfield
U/A Univ. of Minn., Minneapolis

Mississippi

Miss. Coll., Clinton
Miss. State Univ., State College
Tougaloo Southern Christian
Coll.
Univ. of Miss., University

Missouri

Central Coll., Fayette
Central Mo. State Coll.,
Warrensburg
Drury Coll., Springfield
Lincoln Univ., Jefferson City
St. Louis Univ.
Southwest Mo. State Coll.,
Springfield
Stephens Coll., Columbia
Univ. of Kansas City
U Univ. of Mo., Columbia
Washington Univ., St. Louis
Westminster Coll., Fulton
William Jewell Coll., Liberty

Montana

Carroll Coll., Helena
Eastern Mont. Coll. of Education,
Billings
Mont. State Coll., Bozeman
Mont. State Univ., Missoula

Nebraska

Creighton Univ., Omaha
Municipal Univ. of Omaha
Nebraska State Teachers Coll.,
Peru
Univ. of Neb., Lincoln

Nevada

Univ. of Nev., Reno

New Hampshire

U Dartmouth Coll., Hanover
St. Anselm's Coll., Manchester
Univ. of N. H., Durham

New Jersey

Coll. of St. Elizabeth,
Convent Station
Douglass Coll. (Rutgers Univ.),
New Brunswick
Fairleigh Dickinson Univ.,
Madison
Fairleigh Dickinson Univ.,
Teaneck
Fairleigh Dickinson Univ.,
Rutherford

New Jersey

Glassboro State Coll.
 Monmouth Coll.,
 West Longbranch
 Montclair State Coll.,
 Upper Montclair
 Newark Coll. of Eng.
 Orange County Comm. Coll.,
 South Orange
 Princeton Univ.
 Rider Coll., Trenton
 U Rutgers Univ., New Brunswick
 St. Peter's Coll., Jersey City
 Seton Hall Univ., South Orange
 Trenton State Coll.
 Union Junior Coll., Cranford
 Upsala Coll., East Orange

New Mexico

N. M. Highlands Univ.,
 Las Vegas
 N. M. State Univ. of Agr., Eng.
 and Science, University Park
 Univ. of N. M., Albuquerque

New York

Adelphi Coll., Garden City
 Alfred Univ.
 Barnard Coll. (Columbia Univ.),
 New York
 U Brooklyn Coll. (Coll. of the
 City of New York), Brooklyn
 Canisius Coll., Buffalo
 Clarkson Coll. of Tech.,
 Potsdam
 U Colgate Univ., Hamilton
 Coll. of Educ. at Albany (State
 Univ. of N. Y.)
 Coll. of Educ. at Buffalo (State
 Univ. of N. Y.)
 Coll. of Educ. at Cortland
 (State Univ. of N. Y.)
 Coll. of Educ. at Fredonia
 (State Univ. of N. Y.)
 Coll. of Educ. at Potsdam
 (State Univ. of N. Y.)
 Coll. of the City of New York
 U/A Columbia Univ., New York
 U Cornell Univ., Ithaca
 G/A Fordham Univ., New York
 Good Counsel Coll., White Plains
 Hamilton Coll., Clinton
 Harpur Coll. (State Univ. of
 N. Y.), Endicott

New York (cont.)

Hartwick Coll., Oneonta
 Hobart and William Smith Coll.,
 Geneva
 Hofstra Coll., Hempstead
 Holy Trinity Orthodox Sem.,
 Jordanville
 Hunter Coll. (Coll. of the City
 of New York)
 Iona Coll., New Rochelle
 LeMoyne Coll., Syracuse
 Long Island Univ., Brooklyn
 Manhattan Coll., New York
 U Manhattanville Coll. of the
 Sacred Heart, Purchase
 Marymount Coll., Tarrytown
 Millard Fillmore Coll. (Univ.
 of Buffalo), Buffalo
 U Barnard Coll. (Columbia Univ.),
 New York
 New School for Social Research,
 New York
 A New York Univ., New York
 Niagara Univ., Niagara University
 Notre Dame Coll. of Staten
 Island, Grymes Hill
 Orange County Comm. Coll.,
 Middletown
 Polytechnic Inst. of Brooklyn
 Pratt Inst., Brooklyn
 Queens Coll. (Coll. of the City
 of N. Y.), Flushing
 Rensselaer Polytechnic Inst.,
 Troy
 Rochester Inst. of Tech.
 Rockefeller Inst., New York
 St. John Fisher Coll., Rochester
 St. John's Univ., Jamaica
 St. Lawrence Univ., Canton
 St. Vladimir's Othodox Theol.
 Sem., New York
 Sarah Lawrence Coll.,
 Bronxville
 Skidmore Coll., Saratoga
 Springs
 U/A Syracuse Univ.
 Teachers Coll. (Columbia Univ.),
 New York
 Union College and Univ.,
 Schenectady
 U. S. Merchant Marine Academy,
 Kingspoint
 U. S. Military Academy, West Point

New York (cont.)

Univ. of Buffalo
 Univ. of Rochester
 U Vassar Coll., Poughkeepsie
 Wagner Lutheran Coll.,
 Staten Island
 Wells Coll., Aurora

North Carolina

Bennett Coll., Greensboro
 Davidson Coll.
 Duke Univ., Durham
 East Carolina Coll., Greenville
 Johnson C. Smith Univ.,
 Charlotte
 Queens Coll., Charlotte
 State Coll. of Agr. and Eng.
 (Univ. of N. C.), Raleigh
 Univ. of N. C., Chapel Hill
 Wake Forest Coll.,
 Winston-Salem
 Woman's Coll. (Univ. of N. C.),
 Greensboro

North Dakota

State Teachers Coll., Minot
 Univ. of N. D., Grand Forks

Ohio

Antioch Coll., Yellow Springs
 Baldwin-Wallace Coll., Berea
 Bowling Green State Univ.
 Capital Univ., Columbus
 John Carroll Univ., Cleveland
 Case Inst. of Tech., Cleveland
 Central State Coll., Wilberforce
 Coll. of Mt. St. Joseph-on-the-
 Ohio
 Coll. of Steubenville
 Denison Univ., Granville
 Kent State Univ.
 Kenyon Coll., Gambier
 Marietta Coll.
 Miami Univ., Oxford
 Oberlin Coll.
 Ohio Northern Univ., Ada
 Ohio State Univ., Columbus
 Ohio Univ., Athens
 Univ. of Akron
 Univ. of Cincinnati
 Univ. of Dayton
 Univ. of Toledo
 Western Coll. for Women, Oxford
 U Western Reserve Univ.,
 Cleveland

Ohio (cont.)

Wilberforce Univ.
 Wittenberg Univ., Springfield
 Xavier Univ., Cincinnati
 Youngstown Univ.

Oklahoma

East Central State Coll., Ada
 Northern Okla. Junior Coll.,
 Tonkawa
 Okla. Baptist Univ., Shawnee
 Okla. Coll. for Women,
 Chickasha
 Okla. State Univ. of Agr. and
 App. Science, Stillwater
 U Univ. of Okla., Norman
 Univ. of Tulsa

Oregon

Lewis and Clark Coll., Portlan
 Oregon State Coll., Corvallis
 Portland State Coll.
 Reed Coll., Portland
 Univ. of Oregon, Eugene
 Univ. of Portland
 Willamette Univ., Salem

Pennsylvania

Allegheny Coll., Meadville
 Alliance Coll., Cambridge Sprir
 U/G Bryn Mawr Coll.
 Bucknell Univ., Lewisburgh
 Carnegie Inst. of Tech.,
 Pittsburgh
 Chatham Coll., Pittsburgh
 Coll. Misericordia, Dallas
 Dickinson Coll., Carlisle
 Drexel Inst. of Tech., Philadelp
 Duquesne Univ., Pittsburgh
 Franklin and Marshall Coll.,
 Lancaster
 Gannon Coll., Erie
 Gettysburg Coll.
 Harcum Junior Coll., Bryn Ma
 U Haverford Coll.
 Immaculate Coll.
 King's Coll., Wilkes-Barre
 Lafayette Coll., Easton
 LaSalle Coll., Philadelphia
 Lebanon Valley Coll., Annvill
 Lehigh Univ., Bethlehem
 Lycoming Coll., Williamsport
 Marywood Coll., Scranton
 Moravian Coll., Bethlehem

Pennsylvania (cont.)

U Penn. State Univ.,
University Park
Rosemont Coll.
St. Francis Coll., Loretto
St. Joseph's Coll., Philadelphia
St. Vincent Coll., Latrobe
Seton Hill Coll., Greensburg
State Teachers Coll., Indiana
State Teachers Coll., Kutztown
State Teachers Coll., Mansfield
State Teachers Coll.,
Millersville
State Teachers Coll.,
Shippensburg
Swarthmore Coll.,
Temple Univ., Philadelphia
Thiel Coll., Greenville
U/G/A Univ. of Penn.,
Philadelphia
Univ. of Pittsburgh
Univ. of Scranton
Ursinus Coll., Collegeville
Villanova Univ.
Westminster Coll.,
New Wilmington

Puerto Rico

Inter-Am. Univ. of P.R.,
San German
Univ. of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras
Univ. of Puerto Rico, San Juan

Rhode Island

G Brown Univ., Providence
U/G Pembroke Coll. (Brown
Univ.), Providence
Providence Coll.
Univ. of R.I., Kingston

South Carolina

The Citadel—The Military Coll.
of S.C., Charleston
Clemson Agr. Coll.
Converse Coll., Spartanburg
Univ. of S.C., Columbia
Winthrop Coll., Rock Hill
Wofford Coll., Spartanburg

South Dakota

Dakota Wesleyan Univ.,
Mitchell
General Beadle State Teachers
Coll., Madison

South Dakota (cont.)

S.D. School of Mines and Tech.,
Rapid City
S.D. State Coll. of Agr. and
Mech. Arts, Brookings
State Univ. of S.D., Vermillion

Tennessee

George Peabody Coll. for Teachers,
Nashville
Southern Missionary Coll.,
Collegedale
Southwestern at Memphis
Univ. of Chattanooga
Univ. of Tenn., Knoxville
Univ. of Tenn., Nashville
U Vanderbilt Univ., Nashville

Texas

Agr. and Mech. Coll. of Tex.
(Tex. Agr. and Mech. Coll.
System), College Station
Baylor Univ., Waco
Del Mar Coll., Corpus Christi
Frank Phillips Coll., Borger
Lee Coll., Baytown
Mary Hardin-Baylor Coll.,
Belton
North Texas State Coll., Denton
Pan American Coll., Edinburg
Rice Inst., Houston
Sacred Heart Dominican Coll.,
Houston
St. Mary's Univ. of San Antonio
San Angelo Coll.
San Antonio Coll.
Stephen F. Austin State Coll.,
Nacogdoches
Texas Christian Univ.,
Fort Worth
Texas Tech. Coll., Lubbock
Texas Western Coll. (Univ. of
Tex.), El Paso
Trinity Univ., San Antonio
Univ. of Houston
A Univ. of Texas, Austin
Wharton County Junior Coll.

Utah

Brigham Young Univ., Provo
Univ. of Utah, Salt Lake City
Utah State Univ. of Agr. and
App. Science, Logan
Weber Coll., Ogden

Utah (cont.)

Westminster Coll.,
Salt Lake City

Vermont

Bennington Coll.
Inst. of Critical Languages
(summer only), Putney
U Middlebury Coll.
Norwich Univ., Northfield
St. Michael's Coll., Winooski
Univ. of Vt. and State Agr. Coll.,
Burlington

Virginia

Coll. of William and Mary,
Williamsburg
Hampden-Sydney Coll.
Hollins Coll., Hollins College
Mary Washington Coll. (Univ. of
Va.), Fredericksburg
Randolph-Macon Woman's Coll.,
Lynchburg
Richmond College (Univ. of
Richmond)
Richmond Professional Institute
(Coll. of William and Mary)
Sweet Briar College
Univ. of Richmond
Univ. of Virginia, Charlottesville
Virginia Military Inst.,
Lexington
Va. Polytechnic Inst.,
Blacksburg
Washington and Lee Univ.,
Lexington
Westhampton College (Univ. of
Richmond)

Washington

Clark Coll., Vancouver
Coll. of Puget Sound, Tacoma
Gonzaga Univ., Spokane
Olympic Coll., Bremerton
Pacific Lutheran Coll.,
Tacoma
Seattle Univ.
Skagit Valley Coll.,
Mount Vernon
U/G/A Univ. of Wash.,
Seattle
Wash. State Univ., Pullman
Western Wash. Coll. of Educ.,
Bellingham
Whitworth Coll., Spokane

West Virginia

Bethany Coll.
Davis and Elkins Coll.,
Elkins
Marshall Coll., Huntington
W.V. State Coll., Institute
W.V. Univ., Morgantown
Wheeling Coll.

Wisconsin

U Beloit Coll.
Carroll Coll., Waukesha
Lakeland Coll., Sheboygan
Lawrence Coll., Appleton
Milwaukee School of Eng.
Ripon Coll.
U/G Univ. of Wisc.,
Madison
Univ. of Wisc., Milwaukee

Wyoming

Univ. of Wyo., Laramie

Tabulation by State

	<u>1959-60</u>	<u>1960-61</u>	<u>Undergraduate Majors 1960-61</u>	<u>Graduate Majors 1960-61</u>
Alabama	2	6		
Alaska	1	3		
Arizona	3	3		
Arkansas	1	1		
California	41	74	3	3
Canal Zone		1		
Colorado	7	7	1	1
Connecticut	12	14	2	1

Tabulation by State (cont.)

	1959-60	1960-61	Undergraduate Majors 1960-61	Graduate Majors 1960-61
Delaware	1	1		
Dist. of Col.	9	10	1	1
Florida	6	10	2	
Georgia	4	5		
Hawaii	1	1		
Idaho	2	2		
Illinois	18	30	2	2
Indiana	15	22	1	1
Iowa	5	14	2	
Kansas	7	8	1	
Kentucky	2	4	1	
Louisiana	8	9		
Maine	3	4		
Maryland	5	9		
Massachusetts	23	26	5	3
Michigan	13	14	2	1
Minnesota	10	12	2	
Mississippi	2	4		
Missouri	9	12	1	
Montana	4	4		
Nebraska	4	4		
Nevada	1	1		
New Hampshire	2	3	1	
New Jersey	13	18	1	
New Mexico	2	3		
New York	39	59	8	2
North Carolina	7	10		
North Dakota	2	2		
Ohio	21	28	1	
Oklahoma	6	7	1	
Oregon	7	7		
Pennsylvania	35	44	4	2
Puerto Rico	2	3		
Rhode Island	4	4	1	2
South Carolina	3	6		
South Dakota	3	5		
Tennessee	4	7	1	
Texas	18	21		
Utah	5	5		
Vermont	5	6	1	
Virginia	13	14		
Washington	9	11	1	1
West Virginia	1	6		
Wisconsin	6	8	2	1
Wyoming		1		
TOTALS	426	593	48	21

Notes

1. For concision, the names of a town is given in this chart only when it is not clear from that of the institution. E.g., in Alabama, Auburn University is in Auburn, Spring Hill College in Spring Hill, Talladega College in Talladega; but Tuskegee Institute is in Tuskegee Institute (and hence the name of the town is given in full), and the University of Alabama is in University.

2. Key to the symbols appearing before the names of institutions: U—undergraduate major; G—graduate major (M. A., Ph. D., or both); A—area study program.

REVIEWS

Renato Poggioli. *The Poets of Russia: 1890-1930*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960. xxii, 383, \$8.00.

Limiting himself chiefly to the forty-year span, 1890-1930, Professor Poggioli sets as his goal an analysis of what may be termed "The Poetry of Russian Modernism." Beginning with Kantemir, Trediakovskij, and Lomonosov, Professor Poggioli briefly surveys the beginnings of Russian versification. Turning next to Puškin, Lermontov, Tjutčev, Nekrasov, and Fet, among others, he lays a solid foundation for the discussion of the verse of Russian Symbolists and their literary successors.

In his second chapter ("Modernism and Decadence"), he deals deftly with the background for the modernist movement, for what amounted to a cultural revolution on Russian intellectual soil, just as it had been elsewhere in Europe. In his next four chapters, Professor Poggioli divides the early Russian Modernists into two (even three) distinct classes—the Decadents (Aesthetic and Mystical) and the Symbolists proper. Such a division seems logical and defensible on the basis of stylistic peculiarities that distinguish the "Aesthetically Decadent" ("Impressionistic") verse of Bal'mont and Brjusov from the "Mystically Decadent" ("Decadent, proper") poetry of Sologub and Hippius on the one hand, and from the poetry of the "Symbolists"—the disciples of Vladimir Solov'ev: Blok, Belyj, Ivanov. And yet the radical separation of the above-mentioned writers may seem somewhat forced. Despite certain undeniable stylistic differences apparent in their writings, despite certain (not infrequently bitter) aesthetic differences professed by these poets, they did consciously regard themselves as comrades-in-arms, fighting for a common cause. And although the Symbolist movement in Russia cannot be termed a single unified "school," "Decadence" can scarcely be defined as one either. In other words, although one may welcome the recognition of the fact that the poetry of Brjusov and Blok did differ in many important aspects, one might prefer to avoid separating the Decadent and Symbolist camps as radically as does Professor Poggioli.

An examination of the poetry of both the "Aesthetic" and the "Mystical" Decadents will reveal many points in common with the poetry of the Symbolists. The Decadents may not have accepted the cardinal tenet of the Solov'evists, that the physical ("phenomenal") world is but a distorted reflection of the ideal ("noumenal") reality. An adherence to the idealistic dualism that characterizes the world view of the Symbolists, is, nevertheless, apparent in the poetry of the Decadents—including Sologub

and Brjusov, the two poets who least fit the classification "Symbolist." Thus, in much of their verse, all members of the Symbolist rebellion treat phenomenal reality in such a way as to imply a hidden connection between it and some other, mysterious existence on which it somehow depends.

Perhaps both "Decadence" and "Symbolism" may be better envisaged as two diverse, yet closely related and often intertwining, not mutually exclusive, currents, each with its own stylistic peculiarities, reflecting in each case a differing world-view. Certainly the poetry of Belyj, Blok, and Ivanov will reveal typically "decadent" features, just as the poetry of Sologub, Hippius, Balmont, and Brjusov will show typically "symbolist" traits. The complete separation of the "Decadents" from the "Symbolists" on the one hand, and the inclusion of Bunin (who was never regarded by the group as one of them) among the Decadents therefore seems strange. Be that as it may, the Symbolist movement commands (and justly so) the major portion of the book, with the chapter on Blok (VI) being perhaps the high point of the volume.

From the Symbolists, Professor Poggioli proceeds to the Neoparnassians, to Clarists, and Acmeists, and then to the Futurists and Imaginists (Ch. VII, VIII). In chapter IX ("The Poets of Yesterday") he discusses at length the dismal literary scene in Soviet Russia, and ends his volume with a discussion of "The Poets of Today," devoted chiefly to the verse of Pasternak.

A few vexing and puzzling inaccuracies crop up unexpectedly in the text, especially in the section that deals with Symbolist periodicals. Thus, the dates for the *Scales* (1904-9) are erroneously given as "1905-1909" (p. 58), *The Golden Fleece* (1906-9) as "1905-1906" (p. 59), the miscellany *Gryphon* (1903-14) as "1907-1914" (p. 60). Incorrect dates appear for Andreiev (1871-1919), given as "1817-1919" (p. 369), and Apuxtin (1841-93), given as "1814-1893" (ib.). Azef's first name is given as Ėvno rather than Evno (ib.). And Eduard Bagrickij's real name (Dzjubin) is omitted (ib.). Despite these minor faults, Professor Poggioli's volume must be regarded as a major contribution to Russian literary historiography.

Oleg A. Maslenikov
University of California (Berkeley)

Richard Freeborn. *Turgenev: The Novelist's Novelist*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1960. xii, 201.

So much new light has been shed on Turgenev's art in the last thirty years that the need for an extensive reevaluation of his novels has long been felt. The title of Mr. Freeborn's book, with its reference to Henry James's accolade, promises such a work. How disappointing, therefore, to find that it is only used ornamentally, not functionally, that the sense of James's phrase, if it is used at all, is distorted to mean

"the responsibility which devolves upon a writer who strives to make his novels not only a mirror of life, but a mirror of man's conscience" (p. 189). Henry James's first essay on Turgenev (1878) already makes a distinction between figures and things of life and their use by French Poets and Novelists; his later references show his increasing concern for the technique of Turgenev's fiction rather than "what Turgenev has to tell us about the human condition" (p. 192).

Mr. Freeborn has undertaken to analyze Turgenev's "novels" and, concomitantly, to show Turgenev's development. The first two chapters deal with Turgenev's early years and his literary apprenticeship. The next two introduce certain qualities common to his novels—that they are all theatrical ("not stagey or artificial but theatrical in the best sense" [p. 53]), that in all of them "there is the arrival of a stranger," that they are all love stories. The central and most instructive part of the book is that devoted to the "four great novels," which are reviewed four times, under the subheadings Structure, Ideas and Ideals, Hero and Heroine, and The Achievement. Smoke and Virgin Soil are treated differently and in separate chapters: the first to indicate Turgenev's increasing political bias and its deleterious effect on the novel, the second as a failure that anticipates in its schematic artificiality Soviet novels of socialist realism. The final chapter introduces several generalities about Turgenev's attitude toward life, beauty, and art.

In detailing the progress of each novel, Mr. Freeborn makes interesting observations on the contribution of various episodes to the theme of the novel. In the section "Hero and Heroine," he shrewdly notes that the relation of the two main figures always derives from "mutual self-fulfillment," in complementing each other's needs. He shows in considerable detail the way the novels reflect political issues. Still, his approach is so rigorously schematic and so insistent on similarity of theme and character that it robs Turgenev of his richness.

The grave shortcomings of the book, however, stem from Mr. Freeborn's failure to come to grips with his terms. He seems to doubt that Onegin, Hero of Our Time, and Dead Souls are really novels, but he is sure that they do not constitute a tradition (p. 127). Turgenev's work, which ostensibly created the tradition of the novel, is seen as extending the short story form into the novel form and making the latter "a distinctive work of art." But the crucial differences between the two forms are not indicated, either in Turgenev's work or elsewhere. Fathers and Children, according to Mr. Freeborn a direct extension of the technique developed in the three earlier novels, might in reality be seen as a unique work in Turgenev's canon, so radically does its method differ from his other novels. Other key terms are also poorly conceived. Mr. Freeborn believes passionately in the "superfluous man," but his definition and his examples are no more convincing than his notion of tragedy, which he applies to "the wretched Hamlet or the miserable Chulkaturin" (p. 42) or uses six times in five lines as epithets for nature, destiny, misguided aims and division; some characters are "too real or too human to be heroic in the traditional sense" (p. 132); realism, central in this book to both Puškin and Turgenev, is "defined, firstly,

in common human terms. His novels give us pictures of real life which are true to life and acceptable in terms of a reality that every man can experience. Secondly, his novels are realistic in the sense that they are 'social-psychological' representations of epochs in the development of Russian society" (p. 48). The "firstly" is apparent in treating characters as if they had existence outside the artifact. The "secondly" is illustrated in the chapter "Ideas and Ideals" where A Nest of Noblemen, for example, is read as a symbolic recreation of the plight of Russians after 1825 and in other interpretations that are heavily "sociological," if historically not accurate.

Mr. Freeborn's dependence on external matter and his insensitivity to literary values frequently lead him astray. He accepts many of Turgenev's remarks at face value in sketching his early years, and his characters' remarks in sketching them, without questioning the sincerity of the remarks and without showing how they become functional in a work of art. Belinskij is said to play the central role in developing Turgenev's attitudes, but almost nothing is said of formal literary problems Turgenev solved, and which critics like Grossman and Istomin have thought even more significant. If the author had dwelt on the theme of art, the forms with which Turgenev experimented, or the "sketch" in the 1840's, or at least looked more closely at The Hunter's Sketches themselves, he could not have made the extraordinary statement that The Singers is a "genre-picture. . . effective both as literature and as propaganda for the peasant cause" (p. 31). He could not have maintained that The Nest of Noblemen has greater "cohesive structure" than Rudin, for no doubt the most obvious flaw of that book is that it starts in the wrong place so that Turgenev has to interrupt the narrative for the eight chapters of Lavreckij's life. He would not have been able to consider the epilogue in Rudin artistically a more fitting ending than Rudin's disappearance in the steppes (there is no indication at all in this work that the epilogue was added years later). He would not, presumably, have dated the division of Turgenev's characters into the Hamlets and Don Quixotes from 1860, if he had considered that the essay was sketched long before then. But in any case the idea ought not to have been pursued so relentlessly as to consider Odincova or Irina a "Hamlet-type" because they reverse the usual relationship between vacillating hero and moral heroines. Many of Turgenev's characters fit his stated procedures, but there is surely much to be said for other methods, to take an extreme case, the deftness of Kollomejcev's shivering "Brrr" in French.

What Mr. Freeborn means by "structure," "fiction," "the plot-line," "the story element" is far from clear. The first seems to mean simply what happens in each chapter, what the narrative progression may be; the last, the relationship between the leading characters. Something is suggested about setting, but not enough about the integration of each work. Mr. Freeborn does not deal either with the failures or achievements of Turgenev's narrative techniques—which are as important as those of characterization—nor with his style, which is mentioned only at the end, as a model for "anyone learning the language." Most important, he insists on Turgenev's greatness as a novelist, while demonstrating

only his apparent consistency in presenting his matter and in reflecting the ostensible political reality in Russia.

It is unfortunate that Mr. Freeborn has repeated and endorsed so many of the commonplaces Russian sociological critics and Turgenev himself placed in currency, and that are now frequently deemed dubious or irrelevant. By the same token, he has unfortunately utilized few of the more imaginative insights of Russian and Western critics into Turgenev's work and into the nature of prose fiction. Despite its extensive and methodical presentation of certain major themes, Turgenev: The Novelist's Novelist from the literary point of view thus emerges as a pedestrian treatment of Turgenev's works; the "figure in the carpet" turns out to be only a muddy lapot'.

Ralph E. Matlaw
University of Illinois

G. M. Gajdenkov, ed. Russkie poëty XIX veka: Xrestomatija. Moskva, 1960. 942 pp.

Anthologies with the express purpose of giving a "fuller representation" of a particular literary period are difficult to compile even in an atmosphere conducive to such a task. In the U.S.S.R., where literature and literary scholarship are subject to ideological and political control, such a task is complicated. The anthology in question aims to "give the students of the historical-philological faculties and instructors in literatures as complete as possible a picture of the development of Russian nineteenth-century poetry, primarily through examples of smaller lyrical genres." However, it falls short of the mark. What the reader derives from it is an impression that thematically, stylistically, and even ideologically, this poetry was uniform, that the entire century was but a lengthy exercise in revolutionary writing, a preparatory period for the emergence of socialist realism.

The anthology groups the poets into (1) poets of 1790-1830, (2) poets of 1840-50, (3) poets of the 60's, and (4) poets of 1870-90. It presents a selection from the works of each of the 96 poets preceded by a brief biographical vignette.

It is these vignettes which the reader finds tendentious and politically calculating. The lives of these poets are skillfully deprived of the psychological complexity and depth usually characteristic of creative men. One gets the impression that the compiler knows precisely why this or that poet behaved in one way or another, why he chose to write this or the other poem. From these sketches it follows that the source of poetic creation of most of the poets selected was the presence of political radicalism in Russia. The poets are presented either as the Decembrists, or those who stood closely allied with them and shared their ideas, or those who opposed them, as did a few. In any event, according to this presentation, every poet was possessed of radicalism in a positive or

negative sense. Belinskij's criticism, encouragement, or outright disapproval is conceived as a potent stimulus for poetic creativity. Benediktov, Krasov, Ključnikov, Kol'cov, Guber, Ogarev, Polonskij, and many others, it is stated, all became poets merely because of Belinskij's presence.

In the case of those poets who could not be brought to any proximity of agreement with Belinskij, Černyševskij or Dobroljubov, the justification for including them in the anthology was their nationalism or a supposed sympathetic disposition toward political radicalism. Thus, Žukovskij's poems "reflected patriotic emotions of the participant of war with Napoleon"; Katenin felt "the necessity of such poetic forms in which one could express the original national character"; F. N. Glinka, known primarily for his consistently religious motifs and mysticism, is presented as a poet of patriotism. Xomjakov's poetry is full of "civic pathos and sincere patriotism." Tjučev felt the "inevitability of the revolutionary blows and the naïveté of the romantic ideas concerning the harmonious life and the grandeur of individual life."

The tendentiousness of the anthology *ad oculos* reflects itself also in the way in which space was allotted to the different poets. Tjučev, for example, is given nine pages, while Ogarev receives the same amount of space. Durov, who was hardly even known in his own time, gets four pages, whereas Solov'ev receives only two, and even these two pages are filled with poems of secondary significance. Fofanov and Loxvickaja, whose poetry, according to Mirsky, "seemed to be the last word of beauty in the nineties," are given three and two pages respectively, while such poetic nonentities as Balasoglo and Pal'm receive four pages apiece.

The anthology does not omit one single poet from among the Decembrists or members of the Petraševskij's circle, but Merežkovskij and Minskij, for some reason, are left out.

Prerevolutionary anthologies, such as N. V. Gerbel's *Russkie poëty v biografijax i obrazcax*, or A. Sosnickij's *Russkaja poëzija*, or A. N. Sal'nikov's *Russkie poëty* should still be regarded as superior to Gajdenkov's attempt.

John Fizer
University of Notre Dame

Ludwik Krzyżanowski, ed. *Joseph Conrad: Centennial Essays*. New York: The Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America, 1960. 174 pp., \$3.00.

The major theme uniting the essays in this volume seems to be "the exploration of Conrad's Polish antecedents, connections and interests" (Introduction). To this end the work succeeds admirably. Most of the papers have appeared separately in *The Polish Review*, but for this volume they have either been revised or augmented.

Alexander Janta's survey of various American authors, concerning Conrad's present status in the area of belle lettres, provides an interesting prelude to the volume. The replies to his questionnaire affirmed Conrad's high position in the world of letters. Most of the critics chose Richard Curle's eulogistic criticism of Conrad over Virginia Woolf's denigration of Conrad's talents. The rebuttals to Woolf's attack ranged from mild (Katherine Anne Porter) to caustic, as voiced by Bernard Glemser in the following remark: "I would suggest that it is doubtful that Mrs. Woolf's novels will survive, and that Conrad will always have his readers" (p. 17). Only Fannie Hurst and James A. Michener joined Woolf's camp.

The second essay, "Joseph Conrad's 'Prince Roman': Fact and Fiction," by Professor Krzyżanowski, is a well-documented essay, an almost definitive study of the sources of Prince Roman. If it smacks too heavily of the spirit of Polonism, it is an excusable offense committed by a critic who loves deeply. In this essay, as well as in most of the others, two areas of Conradian criticism are explored in greater detail than they have been in any previous studies: Conrad's indebtedness to Polish writers, especially Mickiewicz; and Conrad's concern with the problems besetting Poland after the Polish Insurrection of 1830, as evinced in his works.

This collection, however, is not completely weighted with biographical criticism: A variety of types of scholarship are represented here. Przemysław Mroczkowski has a curiously effective paper on The Lagoon, in which he reconstructs Conrad's technique in writing this short story by leading the reader from section to section, relating much of the action to illustrate his points. His conclusions concerning this story are also a commentary upon Conrad's greater works: "Fatalism will in the future Conrad be completed by heroic stoicism, exoticism will become less superficial and more functional, but generally speaking we have in the little jewel of Lagoon a brilliant presage of the interests which will absorb the writer and the gifts which he will impart to the world" (p. 83).

Valuable materials for the student of Conradiana are also included. Janta's "A Conrad Family Heirloom at Harvard" contains a transcript of Conrad's Tuan Jim: A Sketch, the first outlines of Lord Jim. A selection of correspondence written by Conrad in Polish is also appended to the volume. In addition, a bibliography of recent publications, edited by Krzyżanowski, appears in the index, which alone should make this book a necessary item in any scholar's library. (Most of the articles can be found in Polish publications.) The "Bibliographical Note" suggests the thoroughness of Krzyżanowski's research and is evidence that the volume was truly a labor of love.

Edward J. Czerwinski
Indiana University

Stepas Zobarskas, ed. Selected Lithuanian Short Stories. Second ed. New York: Voyages Press [1960]. 280 pp., \$5.00.

The first edition, of twenty-one short stories from Lithuania translated into the English language, was published in 1959. This new edition includes three important narratives which replace three others of somewhat less value. The editor of the collection, a writer himself, has undoubtedly made a major contribution to the literature of modern short stories. He introduces the American reader to a new terrain of experience and reading pleasure.

However, only a third of Lithuanian short-story writers is represented in this volume. Some of the older as well as from the younger and youngest generation are missing. Also, few of these narratives belong to another genre of literature—the fairy tale or legend. The new edition has them under a separate title—Legends and Tales.

At least a half dozen of these short stories will long remain in memory as real works of art. Such are the short stories of the noted Lithuanian author Šatrijos Ragana, Vincas Krėvė, and Juozas Grušas.

The translation of the Lithuanian text was done by various hands. The editor himself also translated several pieces. Basically the translation is good and close to the original, but some difficulties arose in handling the somewhat strange language of some stories with their peculiarities of main interest to the linguist. Some correction is needed in the orthography of a few proper names, particularly the spelling of the Lithuanian sound *š* (rendered alternately as *sh* and *s*).

The Introduction to the first edition, written by Juozas Brazaitis, former professor of Lithuanian literature at the University of Kaunas, is replaced in this edition by a more general but highly interesting article by Clark Mills of Hunter College.

Biographical notes at the end of the book introduce each author to the reader. The book jacket, by P. Osmolskis, gives an attractive example of Lithuanian folk art.

A. Šešplaukis
Columbia University

Grigore Nandrig. Old Church Slavonic Grammar. (Handbook of Old Church Slavonic, I.) (London East European Series.) Fair Lawn, N.J.: Essential Books, 1959. xvi, 235, 63s.

R. Auty. Texts and Glossary. (Handbook of Old Church Slavonic, II.) (London East European Series.) Fair Lawn, N.J.: Essential Books, 1960. x, 148, 42s.

English-speaking students of Old Church Slavonic (OCS) have a good descriptive grammar of the language, that of Horace G. Lunt. They are still in need of a book which would provide them with a

historical commentary to OCS, as well as of an anthology of selected OCS texts with a glossary and a minimum of commentary. The Handbook of Old Church Slavonic published under the auspices of the University of London is to be judged from the point of view of these needs.

Its second part, the texts and the glossary, compiled by R. Auty, meets these requirements satisfactorily. It consists of selections from all longer OCS texts and, in addition, reproduces Tsar Samuel's inscription, the Prague Fragments, the Freising texts, and several pages from the Ostromir Gospel. The texts are photographically reproduced from the best editions. A. Dostál's new edition of Clozianus (Prague, 1959) came out too late to be used. A glossary follows the texts. The problem of grammatical commentary is adroitly solved by a system of references to pages of the grammar, accompanying the words in the glossary. An introduction elucidates briefly how OCS arose and what was its make-up. In the anthology succinct data about the origin, the contents, and the whereabouts of the manuscript introduce each text.

The book may be criticized for its complete disregard of minor OCS texts, some of them rather important for an understanding of the problems the creators of OCS faced (e.g., the so called Cyrillic Macedonian fragment expounding the principles of translation from Greek); the fragments chosen do not always reflect typical features of the text in question, for instance in those from Marianus we find no forms with initial u- from vъ-, one of the peculiarities which make researchers believe that the manuscript was written somewhere west of Bulgaria. Despite this the anthology will be useful for first readings in OCS. For a more advanced acquaintance students will have to go to larger anthologies or to the complete editions of the texts.

More disappointing is the first and the most important part of the Handbook, the OCS grammar. Only to list all its incorrect or sloppy statements, blunders, or blatant omissions would require a book of no smaller size than the grammar itself. Fortunately for the reviewer, in order to discover the taste of the wine one does not have to drink a whole tun. A glance at the first page will give an idea of the whole. It opens with the statement: "OCS is a South Slavonic dialect from the region of Macedonia used, in the ninth century, by two Greek scholars, Constantine (Cyril) and Methodius of Thessalonica, for their missionary purposes in the Slav countries of Moravia and Pannonia." The definition patently contradicts another definition of OCS as given by Auty, on the first page of his part of the Handbook: "It was a literary language, based primarily on a Macedonian Slavonic dialect but not identical in all its features with the speech of any single area." It is of course the second definition which is close to the truth. Neogrammmarian attempts to identify OCS with a dialect are as naive as obsolete. The real nature of OCS cannot be understood without realizing that this was a literary language, artificial to the extent that every literary language is artificial, even more so in that it encompassed an area with too many Slavic languages and dialects.

On the same page 1 of Nandriš' book we read: "There are preserved tenth- and eleventh-century Moravo-Pannonian texts in both alphabets," i. e., Glagolitic and Cyrillic. The fact is that there are no texts of this provenance written in Cyrillic.

The next statement, that the Kiev Missal and the Prague Folia (called Prague Fragments in the second part) contain "bohemisms" is again at least dubious. The non-South Slavic features of the Kiev Fragments are hardly Czech. If it is positively necessary to label them in terms of the modern Slavic languages they would reveal more affinities with Slovak, though also with reservations.

The sentence which says that "the reduced vowels illustrate the dialectal and chronological aspects of OCS" is a sample of the author's sloppiness in formulations. First of all, the student at this stage of reading does not know that by reduced vowels ъ and ь are meant. Then, what the author apparently wants to say is that we can judge where and when a manuscript was written by establishing whether these vowels were still used by its scribe or omitted in certain positions and replaced by other vowels in some other positions (and by what other vowels). Thus, one should say not that the reduced vowels "illustrate . . . aspects of OCS" but that their presence or absence as well as their substitutes if any.

The statement immediately following contains two errors at once: "These phonemes were already in the oldest texts on the way to losing their independent value and to being used only to define the character of the preceding consonants." What the meaning is of "were on the way to losing their independent value" is fairly unclear. If it suggests that the weak jers were lost, it is incorrect, for in the Kiev Fragments they are still represented quite correctly except for a very few omissions in some specific words. Undoubtedly incorrect and anachronistic is the hint at the value of tverdyj znak and mjagkij znak ascribed to ъ and ь in OCS texts. In addition, the author speaks of phonemes but switches, without even noticing it, to discussing the use of letters.

None of the approximately two hundred pages of text which follows is better than the first page cited. The book is a confusing mixture of dismembered rules concerning the synchronic grammar of OCS, elements of Slavic comparative phonology and morphology, long superseded etymologies (e.g., mlěko, p. 14, čědo, p. 17), etc. Even what is correct is often presented in such inexact formulations, in such an atomistic way, and with such disregard of any chronology and consistency in linguistic changes that no idea of OCS as a system can develop in a reader's mind, nor can OCS be properly delimited from Common Slavic.

To his credit, the author went to the OCS texts directly. He quotes some examples which were not quoted by his predecessors. But this did not inspire him to any original ideas. Even his fresh examples are only used to illustrate second-hand concepts. True, this is a textbook, but it is wrong to think that textbooks must be devoid of originality and new ideas. After all, a textbook should not only introduce students to the subject but also make them love it, a requirement often forgotten but nonetheless very important. Nothing can fulfill this

requirement so well as conveying to the student a sense of the author's searching thought, which, if present, can be and usually is apprehended through the strictest formulations which satisfy the most rigid demands of scholarship.

Nandriš' book will probably be used by those students who can read only in English and who desire a historical commentary to OCS. They have no choice. For those who can read German, even with great difficulty, the "good old" Leskien Handbuch der albulgarischen Sprache still remains indispensable. It is about as obsolete in its data and approach as Nandriš (it was first published in 1871 and revised for the last time in 1910!), but at least its statements are accurate and the diction of a great scholar is still discernable in it.

George Y. Shevelov
Columbia University

Marianna Poltoratzky and Michael Zarechnak. Russkij Jazyk: Pervaja Kniga. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1960. xi, 278, plates, \$4.50.

This new textbook of Basic Russian is intended for college or senior high school use. It consists of twelve lessons covering a variety of topics, from sightseeing in Moscow (in Lesson 2) to a telephone conversation and a dinner in a Russian restaurant (Lessons 11 and 12, respectively). The everyday-life dialogues in the lessons correspond to a set of twelve pictures at the end of the book, so that the students will understand the dialogues more readily and enact them in class.

Although the post-sputnik era has produced a veritable rash of textbooks of Russian, some quite good and others not so good, this joint venture merits more than passing interest. The book has many features that make it attractive, for example, lively Russian dialogues, clearly and lucidly written sections on grammar, a wealth of drill patterns in the exercises. Its vocabulary is very extensive, far more so than that of most other textbooks of this kind. And, last but not least, the rather unusual and very colorful pictures are very well suited for the type of student for which the textbook is intended.

This otherwise fine book is, however, marred by a great number of errors and inaccuracies. Some of these have been spotted by the authors, who have found it necessary to print a two-page corrigenda insert, with the rueful legend: "These unfortunate errors. . . were caused by haste in getting the book out for the summer term."

Beginning with the map of Moscow on the inside of the front cover (where we see Dvorec Trudna instead of Dvorec Truda) and ending with the set of pictures at the end of the book, inaccuracies and misspellings seem to vie with one another. In the subsection on phonetics, no mention is made of the close variety of the Russian stressed e (which occurs initially before palatalized consonants or medially between two such

consonants), although the open varieties of the stressed e are discussed (p. 7). Milicioneru means 'to the policeman' and not 'to the policemen' (p. 68, vocabulary). Otkrojte vaši knigi (p. 72) reveals English influence, as does Čto mal'čik dela'et? 'What is the boy doing?' (p. 80). The word dver' is of feminine gender (p. 81, vocabulary). 'To the station' is in Russian na vokzal, not v vokzal (p. 104). The cavalier treatment of stress marks by the authors, so evident throughout the book, is most disturbing. So is the statement (p. 15) that the genitive singular of rot is rota (sic!). While some of the above errors could be eliminated by better proofreading, the misstatements and mistranslations are not so easily removable from the text.

The section on the pronunciation of Russian, which includes subsections on phonetics and phonemics, is too specialized and technical to be appreciated by the average student or even teacher.

The redeeming features of the book are its lively dialogs and its well-organized sections on grammar. A second edition purged of misprints and outright errors may make an effective text.

Sigmund S. Birkenmayer
Pennsylvania State University

Ten Years of Onomastica

This, the only publication on this continent devoted to the Slavic and American topo- and anthroponymics, is now in its tenth year of existence. It is published by the Ukrainian Free Academy of Science of Winnipeg, Manitoba, under the editorship of Jaroslav B. Rudnyc'kyj, a well-known Slavist in both America and Europe. Recently the twentieth issue of this series made its appearance.

Below are listed (not in chronological order of publication) some issues that appeared from 1951 to 1960 which are of particular interest:

Contribution to the Methods in Onomastics, by G. M. Lucyk (1958)

Canadian Toponymy and the Cultural Stratification of Canada, by W. Kirkconnell (1954)

Canadian Slavic Namelore, by J. B. Rudnyc'kyj (1956)

Indian, Pseudo-Indian Place Names in the Canadian West, by C. M. Jones (1956)

The French Element in Newfoundland Place Names, by E. R. Seary (1958)

Canadian Place Names of Ukrainian Origin, by J. B. Rudnyc'kyj (1952)

The Term and Name "Canada," by I. Velyhorskyj (1955)

Mexico - The Name, by G. Tibon (1959)

The Term and Name "Ukraine," by J. B. Rudnyc'kyj (1951)

The Names "Galicia" and "Volynia", by J. B. Rudnyc'kyj
(1952)

L'origine du nom des Ruthenes, by B. O. Unbegaun (1953)

Les noms de famille ukrainiens, by E. Borschak (1959)

All these works merit attention in the field of onomastics.

John P. Pauls
University of Cincinnati

Helene Iswolsky. Christ in Russia: The History, Tradition, and Life of the Russian Church. Milwaukee: Bruce Publ. Co. [c. 1960]. x, 213. \$3.95.

The book by Miss Iswolsky, who despite her conversion to the Roman Catholic Church has retained her love and admiration for the Russian Orthodox Church, is divided into two unequal parts: "The Russian Church in History," pp. 3-136; and "The Russian Church in Tradition and Life," pp. 139-205. The first part comprises a survey, necessarily sketchy, of the history of Russia from its beginnings to the modern times, emphasizing particularly the interrelation of the Russian Church with the general history. Such a task would be a formidable one, even if a much larger book were devoted to it; to undertake it in some 130 pages makes its treatment inadequate for any other but the most elementary study. From the scholarly point of view it does not meet even the least rigorous requirements.

Moreover, although Miss Iswolsky quotes in her Bibliography a large number of scholarly works (however, she has not included the most recent—A. V. Kartašev's Očerki po istorii russkoj cerkvi [Paris, 1959], of which only the first two volumes have so far appeared), she in many cases simply ignores what these recognized authorities say in regard to the critical interpretation of the subject. She frankly prefers a great deal of legendary material, long ago discarded by these scholars. She begins her story with the mission of St. Andrew, who is said to have reached the very spots where Kiev and Novgorod were later built. She also recounts the mission of St. Clement and asserts that his body was "later discovered in an underwater chapel, miraculously erected" (p. 5). Even the legendary story of the conversion of the Tmutarakan region, and later of Vladimir, are given without a hint of what such historians as Golubinsky have said about them. Instances of this sort are too numerous to be recounted in detail, and mar the value of the book even for popular use.

As a Roman Catholic, she also makes ample use of the views of Vladimir Solov'ev, and quotes almost exclusively from his Russia and the Universal Church, written during the philosopher's most pro-Roman mood. She accepts as a matter of course the view that Solov'ev was a convert to Roman Catholicism (p. 45)—an opinion not borne out by a

critical analysis of his efforts to reunite Roman Catholicism with Russian Orthodoxy. Thus her treatment of the Great Schism lays the blame for it almost entirely on the East. In recounting the story of the False Dmitrij, she prefers as her source Puškin's Boris Godunov, on the basis of which she asserts that the Cracow Jesuit who examined Dmitrij "obviously believes that the young man is . . . so to say, arisen from the grave" (p. 91).

There are errors of fact, such as the dating of the reabsorption of the Ukraine into the Moscovite empire ("eighteenth century" on p. 65; 1686 on p. 90); among the Russian sects of the beginning of the nineteenth century she lists Baptists, Stundists, and "Huepfers"—whoever they were! (p. 118). To enumerate all such instances would be tedious. There are also many misspellings of Russian words, of which "Kievo-Prthcherrsky Laura" takes the cake (p. 4)!

The second part, consisting of five articles previously published in various journals, is—although not without the same kind of features as mar the first part—on the whole much better, because the author deals with her subjects somewhat more extensively and therefore affords the reader more solid information. The best of them, in my judgment, is the article on "Easter," which not only describes the services in great detail, but also points out that Easter typifies the spirit of Orthodoxy. It is a pity that she did not devote the entire book to similar monographs, for she would then have made a real contribution!

Matthew Spinka
Claremont, California

John N. Hazard. Settling Disputes in Soviet Society: The Formative Years of Legal Institutions. (Studies of the Russian Institute.) New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1960. xiv, 534, \$9.50.

It has been part of the Communist gospel that a successful revolution required the destruction of the old state machinery, including the court system, which was defined as "the will of one class made into a law for all." The first decree on courts issued by the new regime abolished the three-level court system inherited from the Tsars, as well as the system of professional barristers, prosecutors, and court investigators. Simplicity was to be the guiding principle in settling disputes: No elaborately organized tribunals, no complicated laws, no labyrinth of rules of procedure and evidence. In 1919, the Commissar of Justice, D. I. Kurskij, proudly announced that the law created by the proletarian revolution had achieved a complete break with pre-revolutionary legal patterns.

Yet three years later the same Kurskij was trying to explain away the necessity of drafting a code of civil law. The 1922 reforms reintroduced a multi-stepped system of courts, a professional prosecutor, and a professional defender. By 1925, Soviet courts were endowed with elaborate rules of civil and criminal procedure.

This process was inevitable. First the Civil War, then the New Economic Policy, and finally the struggle of professional lawyers for a rational set of legal institutions led to a complete centralization of the courts, unification of procedure, and reintroduction of legal formalism.

With infinite patience and cold objectivity, Professor Hazard has woven the scattered mass of government decrees, institutional reforms, speeches, reports and court cases into a coherent and definitive story of considerable historic interest. This is a source book as well as a commentary. It is easily Hazard's most significant work. It shows that the same process through which the Soviet legal system became more sophisticated and professional also made it more vulnerable to encroachments by the party and the government. The reason for this was that the jurists who guided Soviet legal institutions toward their maturity were more concerned with greater efficiency than with "due process" and the rights of citizens.

Serge L. Levitsky
Fordham University

Ukrains'ka radians'ka encyklopedija, Vol. I. Kiyv: Akademija Nauk
URSR, 1960. 640 pp.

The first volume of the long-awaited encyclopedia in the Ukrainian language has finally appeared in the U.S.S.R. In the early thirties, Mykola Skrypnyk, Commissar of Education in the Ukraine, began preparing a twenty-one volume Ukrainian Soviet Encyclopedia, but the venture was halted in its initial stage. The first three volumes were prepared for publication but did not pass the official censorship. The editorial staff was dismissed and the man who initiated the plan committed suicide.

The first volume of the present Ukrainian Soviet Encyclopedia (USE) appeared early last year; it to be followed by the other fifteen planned volumes by 1964-65. The first volume, though it covers only the letter A and part of B, give a good idea of what to expect in the following ones. The USE is heavily oriented toward Soviet subjects and interpretations; the proportion of materials devoted to Soviet Communist and Ukrainian materials is approximately two-thirds. The Ukrainian materials, on the other hand, constitute approximately one-third of the volume.

We shall dwell particularly on the Ukrainian materials in our comments below, for they are what distinguish this encyclopedia from the Bol'shaja sovetskaja enciklopedija. The history and culture of the Ukraine, from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries, have been treated fairly exhaustively. The USE gives biographies of many Ukrainians active chiefly in cultural areas, and about whom very little has hitherto been written. A relatively briefer and more selective treatment has been given to figures of the twentieth century. Historical figures connected with the Ukrainian national movement are mentioned very superficially, if at all.

The USE omits mention of Ukrainians who during their lifetimes—or sometimes even after their deaths—came into conflict with Soviet ideology, with the exception of those who were rehabilitated during the period 1956-58. For example, there is no mention of such founders of the Soviet regime in the Ukraine as M. Avdienko, Volodymyr and Otto Aussem. Also omitted, curiously enough, is the biography of the still living former minister of foreign affairs of the Ukrainian SSR, A. Baranovskij, though there are a number of biographical sketches of "innovator" collective farm workers.

There is almost no mention of Ukrainians active outside the Soviet Union, except those few who could not possibly be passed over tacitly (e.g., M. Hruševskij). For examples, the world-famous sculptor, A. Arčipenko, is not mentioned, though he is mentioned in most of the world's encyclopedias. Ukrainian creative literature abroad finds a dim reflection in the mention of only one name, Bohdan Antonyč. Furthermore, there is actual falsification in the article on the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, where it is stated that the institution was founded in 1919; whereas, it was actually founded by Hetman Pavlo Sokropadskij in 1918.

On the other hand, credit can be given for such general articles as those on agronomy, archaeology, and arithmetic, where the contribution of Ukrainian scientists to these sciences and their present stage of development in the Ukraine are given, as well as general material. And one may add that among the other good features of the USE is that it should fix Ukrainian terminology in various branches of science. This is important, in view of the general tendency toward Russification. Finally, the very fact that now an encyclopedia will be available in Ukrainian—and not merely in Russian—for the millions of readers in the Ukraine, is a positive event in Ukrainian national life.

Vasyl Markus
University of Notre Dame

Stanley W. Page. The Formation of the Baltic States. (Harvard Historical Monographs, XXXIX.) Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1959. x, 193, \$4.50.

In his Preface the author states that "this study is the first attempt to examine in detail, and comparatively, the sequence of events through which Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia passed in the process of becoming independent nations." Mr. Page then asks himself the main question: "How was it possible in the age of superpower for such pygmy states to come to life, even granting the miracles wrought by Wilson's Fourteen Points?" The author then proceeds to answer his question. After giving a brief account of the history of the Baltic nations up to 1914 Mr. Page plunges into the most difficult task of describing and analyzing the series of events on the eastern shores of the Baltic between 1914 and

1920. The author shows how the Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians succeeded in moving their countries toward independence through the turmoil of German military occupation, Bolshevik terror, and the attempt of the Landeswehr to hold on to the Baltic territories.

Although the Allied Powers showed some sympathetic signs toward the aspirations of the Baltic peoples, Mr. Page believes that they were actually little interested in the existence of independent Baltic states, but rather thought only in terms of the usefulness of the Baltic peoples in the battle against Bolshevism. This lack of interest in Baltic independence, Mr. Page believes, was shown in the Allies' negotiations with General Kolchak and their recognition of the White Russian government, to whom the Allies gave a free hand to deal with the Baltic and other national minorities within a "united Russian state" after a Bolshevik collapse.

Mr. Page shows how "by the beginning of 1919 the Allies were pursuing an interventionist policy in the Baltic and were attempting to employ three forces—German, Baltic governments, and the White Russians—each pulling in a separate direction." Only when the German Balts and their Landeswehr carried out a coup d'état and arrested the Latvian government, did the Allies begin to realize their mistaken trust in the Germans. With the collapse of the White Russian armies in the fall of 1919 the major Allied reason for opposing an independent peace between Bolshevik Russia and the three Baltic states disappeared. With the German armed forces and the Landeswehr gone and Bolshevik Russia offering full recognition to all three Baltic countries, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania signed separate peace treaties with Russia in 1920.

Throughout his book Mr. Page stresses the fact neither Bolshevik Russia, Imperial Germany, nor the Allied Powers favored the establishment of independent Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. It was only due to the fact that Germany and Russia were weakened by war and revolutions, and the Allied Powers were interested in the establishment of a cordon sanitaire against Bolshevik Russia, that the Baltic nations could achieve their short-lived national independence.

Alfred Erich Senn has given a scholarly and objective study on the emergence of independent Lithuania; Mr. Page's book is indeed the first detailed account on the emergence of Latvia and Estonia in the English language. Although a considerable number of books have been written on the same subject in Russian, Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian, most if not all have stressed the positive attitude of the Allies and the heroism and national unity of the three Baltic nations as the major historical forces which paved the road to national independence. To my knowledge, with the exception of Mr. Senn's book on Lithuania, Mr. Page's work is the first to reveal the real motives of each participant in the struggle for the Baltic. Mr. Page has presented in an objective and scholarly way the very complicated phase of the emergence of the three Baltic states. For those with only a general knowledge of the closing years of World War I, this monograph will open new vistas of the fate of small nations in the grip of great-power politics.

Altamur Kilic, Turkey and the World. Introd. William O. Douglas.
Washington: Public Affairs Press [c. 1959]. 224 pp., \$4.50.

This work is representative of the trend among the new and re-surgent nations of Asia and Africa to rewrite their history in their own image. With few exceptions, the standard histories of Turkey available in European languages have been written by Westerners, from a Western vantage point. Kilic, recently a Press Attaché at the Turkish Embassy in Washington, affirms that because of this situation the world has obtained a distorted image of the Turks and their problems.

The Western concept of Turkey's treatment of her Christian minority is a case in point. Although the Turks made every effort to conciliate the Armenians, invariably the latter "betrayed their trust." World opinion, aroused by the Turkish massacre of the Armenians, remained unconcerned and uninformed about the Armenian massacre of 40,000 Turks following the Russian Revolution (p. 18).

The author regards Turkey's failure to assimilate her minorities as a serious error which undermined Turkish nationalism. It was the defection of the Muslim Arab population in World War I which led the Turks, under Atatürk, to abandon the concept of a multi-national state for a Turkish national state. Kilic is sympathetic, however, toward an exploitation of the ties of affinity between the Turks, on the one hand, and the Soviet and Red Chinese Turkic minorities, on the other, with a view to promoting the liberation of the latter (pp. 210, 214).

This work emphasizes Turkey's traditional orientation toward Western Europe and, more recently, toward the United States. Deviations from this policy the author attributes to Western rejection of a pro-Turkish alignment, as in the case the German alliance in World War I, Turkish rapprochement with Soviet Russia following the Treaty of Sèvres (1920), and Turkish neutrality in World War II. Kilic's chapter on "The War Years: 1939-1945" constitutes an apology for Turkey's neutrality, which he maintains was basically in the Allied interests, since it served to contain Soviet imperialism. Such neutrality, labelled "anachronistic and accidental," could not happen again, since Turkey now "stands or falls with the West" (p. 206). Turkey's foreign policy today, founded on the legacy of Atatürk, is summed up succinctly by Kilic as follows: "to seek no territorial gains outside the present boundaries; to show vigilance and determination against Soviet threats and to stand with the West" (p. 205).

In general, Kilic's approach to the contemporary international situation reflects the policies of the Menderes regime. It is pro-American, although the author insists that American "realism" toward Turkey—the use of American aid as a political instrument to serve United States interests—is "unrealistic" to the Turks (p. 203). He calls for more interest in and understanding of the Turkish Republic and its problems.

Ivar Spector
University of Washington

RECENT WORKS IN EAST EUROPEAN FOLKLORE

Julian Krzyżanowski. Mądrej głowie dość dwie słowie. 2 vols.
Warsaw: Instytut Wydawniczy, 1956-60. 610 and 528 pp. Zł.
40 each.

This collection of studies of five hundred Polish proverbs is very probably the most important contribution to paroemology in recent years. A recognition of this is to be seen in the fact that the second edition of the first volume is published in eight thousand copies! The book appears in a dress appropriate to its merit: the type is large and pleasing, the paper is good, and the illustrations are numerous. There are excellent indexes. Krzyżanowski comments chiefly on proverbs found in Adalberg's standard collection, but often goes farther afield. His remarks are ordinarily limited to Polish comparisons. Particularly welcome are the citations of pertinent folk-narratives associated with the texts. Mikolaj Rej, Facecje, and exemplum-books are often cited. When it is necessary, Krzyżanowski crosses national boundaries readily. Thus, he discusses "When Adam delved and Eve span, Who was then the gentleman?" with awareness of medieval German and English parallels. To the remarks on "ager dei" (II, 154) add my note, "'God's Acre' Once More," Modern Language Notes, LXVII (1952), 341. To the remarks on "If the mountain does not come to Mahomet, Mahomet must go to the mountain" add a reference to Albert Wesselski, Märchen des Mittelalters (Berlin, 1925), pp. 263-265. Krzyżanowski cites Wesselski's book in other connections, but missed this definitive discussion of the proverb for some strange reason. I commend Krzyżanowski's book warmly.

János Berze Nagy. Régi Magyar népmesék. Eds. István Banó and Sándor Dömötör. Pécs: Tudományos ismeretterjesztő társulat baranya megyei szervezete, 1960. 271 pp. Ft. 35.

This attractively got-up volume contains tales (märchen and jests) collected by János Berze Nagy that he had not published at the time of his death in 1944. Since they were written down before 1917, they belong to a time before the present systematic effort to collect Hungarian narrative traditions. Their value to students is enhanced by brief but adequate critical and comparative notes. The volume also includes Berze Nagy's prizewinning historical and critical essay, "A mesetípusok irodalmának kritikai ismertetése" (pp. 241-257). Although much has happened since it was written in 1921, it ought to be summarized or translated. I know no other accounts of Lazar Şăineanu's and Ludwig Katona's schemes of classification. Berze Nagy devoted his life to making an extremely valuable classification of Hungarian tales. This essay is therefore significant for its role in the development of his ideas apart from its value as a historical survey. A very brief concluding essay, "Az Alkestis-tragédia és egy magyar népmese" (pp. 258-260), is worthy of remark as a contribution to our knowledge of

a much-discussed tale (No. 803** in Berze Nagy's classification) with possible connections with the famous English and international ballad, "The Maid Freed From the Gallows." G. A. Megas has recently refused to see any connection between the two narratives, and Berze Nagy does not discuss the subject. All in all, a collection of more than ordinary importance and interest.

Linda Dégh. Kakasdi népmesék, II. (Új Magyar népköltési gyűjtemény, 9.) Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1960. 400 pp.

This collection of fifty-nine recently collected and admirably annotated folktales is a very welcome addition to our resources for the study of folktales in Hungarian tradition and tradition generally. The annotation is keyed to the Aarne-Thompson types with frequent references to János Berze Nagy, Magyar Népmesetípusok (2 vols., Pécs, 1957), which contains many additions to these types. A substantial list (pp. 355-399) of words needing to be explained no doubt contains materials for students of Hungarian linguistics. I commend this book warmly.

Ingrid Schellbach. Das vogulische Rätsel. (Ural-Altäische Bibliothek, VIII.). Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1959. 136 pp., DM 16.

The author brings together various printed collections of Vogul riddles and adds some manuscript materials from Finnish archives to make this collection of some 800 texts. We have therefore what may be called a master-collection such as already exists for Cheremis, Yakut, and Mongolian riddles, to mention only those available for Siberian tribes. It is a valuable addition to our knowledge of riddling. It contains only what Robert Petsch has called "true riddles," i.e., confusing comparisons that suggest an object entirely different from the true solution. Thus, for example, "A youth in a white shirt drags about a [black] coal," with the solution "Ermine." Since Dr. Schellbach cites no instances of other varieties of riddling, she might have condensed the somewhat unsatisfactory general remarks (p. 9-11) that involve these other varieties. Here I would question the generalization, "So wird jedes Ding . . . in der Rätselsprache, zu dem, was . . . seine Funktion anzudeuten scheint" (p. 11). Riddling in terms of intentionally misleading comparisons does not deal with significant functions of the solution. An egg is not described as something to be eaten or something that produces little chicks, nor an ermine as a fur-bearing animal. There is a very welcome brief account of the home, history, and cultural background of the Voguls (pp. 17-19) with a map.

Dr. Schellbach does not cite parallels to the texts and consequently does not show what texts enjoy a general Siberian or a Finno-Ugric, currency or are Russian borrowings. In other regards, the commentary is admirable. The discussion of the objects suggested in the comparisons (pp. 84-90) and the solutions of the riddles (pp. 91-131) is very well done and is presented in a convenient manner. The remark (p. 98) that the lack of references to sacred trees and trees used in sacrifices is

surprising (p. 98) calls for comment. This omission is characteristic of riddling generally. Riddles deal with objects in their general use and not in their use in particular circumstances. Among the many riddles in English or German for an egg it would be difficult to find one for an Easter egg. Dr. Schellbach's excellent collection might serve as a model for other collections.

Demos: Volkskundliche Informationen. Berlin, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften, Institut für deutsche Volkskunde: Akademie-Verlag, 1960. Two fascicles a year. DM 10 ea.

This new journal published with the co-operation of the institutes for folklore and ethnography attached to academies in Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, and the U.S.S.R. intends to offer a systematic critical survey of folkloristic publications in these countries. It begins for example with a section containing twenty-two bibliographies published between 1947 and 1958 that deal either with folklore generally or with special fields, e.g., No. 11 is a list of 249 books and articles on Polish textiles. Each entry is accompanied by a good critical résumé. Interest in the folktale has not been very keen; see Nos. 117-122, with seven additional titles cited as cross-references. The small number of titles is partially explained by the complete lack of Russian writings. Not even the new edition of Afanas'ev's collection (3 vols., Moskva, 1957) is mentioned! There are twenty-three titles of books and articles dealing with Bulgarian, Czech, and Hungarian folksong. I have disregarded eleven cross-references; Albanian, Polish, Rumanian, and Russian titles are lacking. Many of the titles appear to be very important works and are highly commended by the reviewers, e.g., Leoš Janáček, O lidové písni a hudbě: Dokumenty a studie (Prague, 1955, pp. 661), which appears to be a significant contribution especially to the study of tunes; Vladimír Ulehla, Živa píseň (Prague, 1949, pp. 833), a popular book with excellent comment on international connections; and so on. "Folklore" is, it might be said understood in the broad European sense that includes also folk-art, domestic architecture, folk-belief, and popular medicine. Since the international Volkskundliche Bibliographie is now several years behind schedule and since it does not contain résumés, Demos is heartily welcome. It is more than welcome: it is indispensable.

Archer Taylor
University of California (Berkeley)

BRIEF NOTICES

Alexander V. Soloviev. Holy Russia: The History of a Religious-Social Idea. (Musagetes, XII.) 's-Gravenhage, 1959. 61 pp.

Professor A. Soloviev's little book, a republication "with some slight emendations" of an article of his written in 1927 for the Sbornik Russkogo Arxeologičeskogo Obščestva v Korolevstve SHS, in Belgrade, represents a brief but interesting and sparkling survey of the historical fortunes of the concept of Holy Russia from the days of the Kievan state until 1917. With a sure hand the author deals with Kievan literature, Muscovite sources, and such modern writers as Komjakov, Dostoevskij, and Vladimir Solov'ev, although in the last case he appears to overstate Solov'ev's Slavophilism. The selection of old texts strikes the reader as particularly able and impressive.

Yet certain aspects of Professor Soloviev's study invite criticism—two especially. The author writes on the basis of metaphysical, or metaphysical-religious, assumptions not shared by many scholars today, and, unfortunately, these assumptions are blended into the texture of his work. The following passage illustrates well the author's view of his subject: "Russia came to Christ after almost all the other countries of Europe, but she embraced His doctrine fervently and sincerely. As the youngest, and therefore favourite disciple of Christ, she imbibed the most profound aspects of His inexhaustible teaching. And to this day, foreign scholars who have succeeded in approaching close to the soul of the Russian people have been struck by the spiritual significance of the Russian conception of Christianity." (pp. 7-8.)

Also, Professor Soloviev tends to exaggerate the scope and importance of his topic, for example, in his treatment of the idea of Moscow as the Third Rome or in his attempts to link the Russian Empire to the concept of Holy Russia. The issue here is not so much mistaken assertions as the fact that, deprived of background and balancing factors in general, the idea of Holy Russia stands in too stark relief. The book is likely to mislead those who do not possess a thorough knowledge of Russian history.

In welcoming Professor Soloviev's stimulating brief study, it seems appropriate to express the hope that both he and other scholars will investigate further the interesting subject of Holy Russia.

Nicholas V. Riasanovsky
University of California (Berkeley)

Ina Telberg, comp. Who's Who in Soviet Science and Technology. New York: Telberg Book Co. [c. 1960]. iii, 119, \$12.80.

Who's Who in Soviet Science and Technology is part of "a continuing experiment in small circulation translation of material on the USSR." Arranged alphabetically, these short biographies (average length 8 to 10 lines) include date of birth, university education, Party membership, university and other academic affiliations, positions held, major fields of interest and publication, for approximately 1000 "prominent . . . living" Soviet scientists and technologists. The information was culled from

Biografičeskij slovar' dejatelej estestvoznaniya i tekhniki (Moskva, 1958), which was in turn based on the second edition of the Great Soviet Encyclopedia.

Dr. Ina Telberg, who has compiled this useful volume, the first of its kind available in English, does not suggest the standard of prominence necessary for inclusion, nor does she tell us whether the scientists were living as of 1958 (the date of the Russian publication) or 1960. Nor does she indicate in her Preface that a decree, late in 1959, officially ended the practice common among Soviet scholars of holding two positions: in a university and in one of the institutes of the Academies. Thus the American scientist wishing to locate a Soviet counterpart will not be able to end his search in this volume. No cross-indexing by field of interest is attempted, although this would have increased the usefulness of the volume.

Few women are included. Of the men the largest proportion were born prior to the Revolution, many in the last century, completing their education prior to 1917. Hopefully future addenda to this Who's Who . . . will include younger Soviet scientists and technologists, although this information will be harder to assemble.

The typing of this mimeographed "manuscript edition" is generally good. Unfortunately, however, the first entry credits I. K. Abdullaev with membership in the Party since 1939, despite his being only five years old then. Such success would be meteoric, even in the Soviet Union.

Stephen Viederman
Indiana University

[M. B. Bolostnova, comp.] Dictionary of Russian Geographical Names. Tr. T. Deruguine. Second Printing. New York: Telberg Book Co. [c. 1958]. iii, 82 pp.

[M. S. Bodnarskij.] Russian-English Geographical Encyclopedia. New York: Telberg Book Co. [1960]. x, 142 pp.

As part of a translation series, the Telberg Book Company has recently issued two gazetteer-type reference works pertaining to the Soviet Union. One of these books, the Dictionary of Russian Geographical Names, is a translation of the Slovar' russkoj transkripcii geografičeskix nazvanij (1955). As the title implies, this work provided a detailed list of Soviet cities, oblasts, and natural features, which are located by geographical co-ordinates and political-administrative subdivisions. The usefulness of this reference-work is limited by the failure of the Russian original to include Pre-Revolutionary place names and by the surprising omission of accent marks on the stressed syllables of Soviet place names in the English version.

The Russian-English Geographical Encyclopedia is a more descriptive title for the second Telberg translation than would be provided by more faithful adherence to the Russian title: Slovar' geografičeskix nazvanij (1958). The English version of this study gives a brief summary of the salient characteristics of Soviet urban centers, oblasts, and natural features. This book contains a somewhat more comprehensive survey of Soviet geography than is usually found in Western gazetteers. However, the Telberg translation eliminates some of the strongest features of the Russian original. Not only are stress marks eliminated in translation, but, also, the original descriptions of Soviet places are shortened in innumerable instances.

In summary, the Telberg translations do not provide an adequate substitute for the Russian originals. These translations could be of use, however, to non-Russian-speaking scholars.

Stanley E. Hebel, comp. Map of Population Density of the USSR. New York: Telberg Book Company, 1959.

This four-sheet Telberg map of Soviet population density is based on a 1956 Russian map, Plotnost' naselenija SSSR. The legend is in English, while place names are in both Latin and Cyrillic form. The visual clarity of this map is diminished by the haphazard manner in which latinized place names have been superimposed and by the retention of Cyrillic place names, many of which are illegible. The utilization of 1956 population estimates rather than the results of the partially released 1959 census is compensated for, to a certain extent, by an inset map in English depicting the 1959 population of five broad regions and the rate of their population growth since 1939. Despite several shortcomings, the Telberg map is undoubtedly the best cartographic source on Soviet population density presently available in English.

Robert N. Taaffe
Indiana University

Pavlo Shandruk. Arms of Valor. Tr. Roman Olesnicki, Introd. Roman Smal-Stocki. New York: Robert Speller & Sons Publishers [1960]. 320 pp., \$6.00.

This is "the story of the fight of the Ukrainian soldiers for the independence of their state" (as the publisher aptly says) by Pavlo Shandruk, Lieutenant General of the General Staff of the Ukrainian National Army.

For the first time in the English language, General Shandruk as an active participant gives a broad and comprehensive account of the Ukrainian military and political struggles in the last forty years, beginning with 1918-20. The most interesting and revealing material is in the second half of the book, where the author relates of his experiences as Commander-in-Chief of the Ukrainian National Army and President of the Ukrainian National Committee during World War II.

To achieve independence for Ukrainia from Russia, the Ukrainians had to organize an army and obtain weapons. Thus, many of them joined the Underground Movement or U. P. A. (Ukrajins'ka Povstans'ka Armija) soon after the German forces occupied the country. The freedom fighters of U. P. A. fought both Germans and Russians. On the other hand, after long negotiations with the German Nazi government General Shandruk and others were allowed to organize from volunteers the Ukrainian National Army in German uniforms with German weapons and under the higher German command. Hitler wanted an additional military force for his diminishing armies; General Shandruk and his patriotic associates strove to have soldiers with modern weapons which could defend the cause of Ukrainia's independence. In their own ways, both of them failed to achieve final success. Nevertheless, this period is very interesting for study of the Ukrainian patriots' aspirations under the unusually difficult conditions and hostility of both Germany and Russia.

General Shandruk wrote his vivid recollections with a thorough knowledge of World War II and without any prejudices. The book is read not only as a participant's account of East European events of the time but as a study with often a deep analysis of Hitler's defeat, to which Ukrainia largely contributed, though she did not win independence from Soviet Russia.

Yar Slavutych
University of Alberta

Josef Korbél. The Communist Subversion of Czechoslovakia, 1938-1948: The Failure of Coexistence. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press, 1959. xii, 258. \$5.00.

The suicidal road that the Czechoslovak democracy took under President Beneš, who at first thought his country could "co-exist" with Soviet Russia, has been described by several specialists. But Korbél's analysis is the most definitive survey of the fateful days of the Munich Crisis in September 1938 to the final coup in February 1948, showing especially well the gradual erosion of all areas of Czechoslovakia's life—political, economic, cultural, military, social—by the Communist techniques. But the most tragic sections are those dealing with the hopeless attempts at coexistence on the part of the democratic leaders, including Jan Masaryk, as they tried to negotiate with such Communists as Klement Gottwald and Stalin. The author, the former head of Jan Masaryk's Cabinet in the Czechoslovak Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and now Professor at Denver University, uses Czech, French, and German sources. No material in Russian is included in the "Bibliography," (pp. 243-247), which, incidentally, has omitted several studies in American periodicals of Beneš' memoirs. In spite of these minor weaknesses, Korbél's is an admirable introduction to its topic.

Joseph S. Roucek
University of Bridgeport

Vasilij Klyuchevsky. Peter the Great. Tr. Liliana Archibald. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1958. xii, 282, \$6.75.

Vasilij Ključevskij, who died in 1911, was Russia's greatest historian, and Mrs. Archibald has performed a useful service in making available a fine translation of the fourth volume of his great History of Russia, the volume which deals with the era of Peter the Great and the social and administrative changes which that great ruler introduced into Russia.

However, for all its virtues, this volume is not so good a study of Peter and his impact on Russia as the 1950 study of the late Benedict H. Summer, Peter the Great and the Emergence of Russia. Ključevskij is especially strong in social history but pays little attention to foreign policy, an area in which Peter was immensely important.

This book does contain two interesting illustrations and a most useful map. Mrs. Archibald also provided notes, strongly concentrated in the first half of the book and reflecting the research only of Western scholars. There is no bibliography, although one would have added an extra virtue to a handsome and most useful volume.

Anatole G. Mazour. Rise and Fall of the Romanovs. (Anvil Books, No. 50.) New York: D. Van Nostrand [c. 1960]. 189 pp., \$1.25.

This brief book was written by Professor Mazour of Stanford University on the proper assumption that a history of the Romanov dynasty from 1613 until 1917 would illuminate the history of Russia itself, because of the authority and influence the Russian monarchs had. Sixty percent of the volume is devoted to a study of Russian court history and international relations, by reign, and the last one hundred pages consists of readings selected for their interest and significance.

Court history of this kind has some utility, particularly in a country such as Russia where the autocrat did in fact have the power to shape history. The disadvantages of this approach are very great, however, and he who learned his Russian history only from this volume would acquire very shallow knowledge indeed.

Stanislaw Kot. Georges Niemirycz et la lutte contre l'intolérance au 17e siècle. (Musagetes, VIII.) 'S-Gravenhage, 1960. 78 pp.

This is a brief but learned and eloquent biography of Georges Niemirycz who was more responsible than anyone else for the treaty of Hadiacz, signed in 1657 and ratified in 1659. This treaty between Poland and the Ukraine might have ended conflict between Poland and the Ukraine and assured the Ruthenians of peaceful independence. It might also have blocked the expansion of Moscow toward both the Black and the Baltic seas. However, Poland was weak, the Ukraine was unruly, and Moscow was powerful and aggressive—so Hadiacz and its Socinian author, who was the chancellor of the briefly independent Ukrainian duchy, were destroyed in 1659.

This is a fine short biography, with considerable information on the religious issues which plagued this part of the world in the seventeenth

century. Its description of the swirling and confusing relations among the various peoples and states of East Central Europe, however, is not adequate.

Robert A. Kann, A Study in Austrian Intellectual History: From Late Baroque to Romanticism. New York: F. A. Praeger [c. 1960]. xxii, 367, \$6.00.

This volume is an ambitious effort to describe and analyze the intellectual and cultural history of Austria in the second half of the seventeenth and in the second half of the eighteenth centuries by describing the lives and ideas of two "representative" figures, neither of whom has attracted the attention of scholars. Treatment of these men, Ulrich Megerlin, known as Abraham a Sancta Clara, a noted seventeenth century Augustinian court preacher, and Joseph von Sonnenfels, an eighteenth century enlightened reformer, scholar, teacher, and official, therefore provides the core of this solid study. Both men were interesting and even exciting personages of great significance and the book is valuable just for the attention it draws to them.

Professor Kann is immensely learned in central European history, and the study reflects years of research and thought in this country, in foreign libraries, and in Austrian archives. His style, alas, is very ponderous and awkward, and the printing and proof-reading do not reflect infinite care.

Writing intellectual history by selecting two "representative" individuals is always a hazardous enterprise, and Professor Kann might have produced a more valuable book if he had approached his subject in the more traditional way or if he had written a biography of one of his two major subjects. However, the main features of Austrian intellectual life come through clearly, and the book does describe well the main forces which ensured that Austrian intellectual development should be relatively conservative and stable during the fascinating years.

Ivo D. Duchacek, with the collaboration of Kenneth W. Thompson. Conflict and Cooperation Among Nations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston [c. 1960]. xvi, 649, \$6.50.

This is a most interesting combination of textbook and selection of readings in the field of recent international relations. Professor Duchacek, the main author, was a legislator in Czechoslovakia before 1948 and the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the legislature. This experience, his work as a foreign correspondent, and the decade and more which he has devoted to teaching in this country have given him an insight into current problems in the field of international relations which few American scholars possess.

The volume is designed for class use. It seeks to analyze and illuminate the relations among the great powers, particularly in the Cold War. It contains six sections divided into a total of twenty-eight topics, and the descriptions and analyses of the situations and problems are

supported by reprints of seventy-five "essays" written by scholars and policy-makers. It has no maps and no bibliography. It clearly looks at the world from the American point of view; more accurately, while essays or articles by many foreign scholars and statesmen are reprinted, the problems raised and reviewed are those which excite Americans today. The historical background provided in the textual material is probably not adequate for the undergraduates for whom the book was designed.

Denis Sinor. History of Hungary, New York: F. A. Praeger [c.1951]. 310 pp., \$5.00.

This is a brief political history of Hungary from the nomadic Magyar tribes through World War II. Professor Sinor, of Magdalen College, Cambridge, recognizing the absence of a one-volume history of his native country in English and noting that most work on Hungary published in England and America was written by men and women who did not read Hungarian, wrote the volume to provide a continuous narrative history based on materials in Hungarian as well as in other languages.

The book is clear and useful. It would have been far more valuable in stimulating young scholars if it had a bibliography or notes. Moreover, it has an ultra-conservative bias. Finally, it devotes only nine pages to the period from the end of World War I through 1945, with the period since 1945 neglected completely.

Robert F. Byrnes
Indiana University

BOOKS RECEIVED

Jonas Balys. Lithuanian Folksongs in America: Narrative Songs and Ballads. (Treasury of Lithuanian Folklore, V.) Boston: Lithuanian Encycl. Publ., 1958. xlii, 326 pp.

Raymond A. Bauer et al. How the Soviet System Works: Cultural, Psychological, and Social Themes. (Vintage Russian Library, R-1004.) New York: Vintage Books, 1960. xvi, 312, xii, \$1.25.

Jurij Borys. The Russian Communist Party and the Sovietization of Ukraine: A Study in the Communist Doctrine of the Self-Determination of Nations. Stockholm, 1960. x, 374 pp. [Can be ordered from the author: Pilgatan 11, Stockholm K, Sweden.]

California Slavic Studies, Vol. I. Berkeley and Los Angeles: California Univ. Press, 1960. 196 pp., \$5.00.

Maria Danilewiczowa. Pierścień z herkulanum i płaszcz pokutnicy: Szkice literackie. London: Świderski, 1960. 384 pp.

Isaac Deutscher. Stalin: A Political Biography. (Vintage Russian Library, R-1003.) New York: Vintage Books, 1960. xxiii, 600, \$1.65.

- Directory of Soviet Officials, Vol. I: Personnel in the Communist Party, Government, and Mass Organizations of the U.S.S.R. and R.S.F.S.R. Biographic Directory No. 272. Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, August 1960. xix, 227 pp.
- Vladimir Reisky de Dubnic. Communist Propaganda Methods: A Case Study on Czechoslovakia. New York: F. A. Praeger [c. 1960]. xiv, 287, \$6.00.
- I. B. Faden. A Book of Russian Idioms. London: Methuen and Co., 1960. 64 pp., 6/6.
- Mischa H. Fayer. Basic Russian. Book II. New York: Pitman [c. 1961]. xvi, 384 pp.
- G. P. Fedotov. Svjatye drevnej Rusi (X-XVII st.). New York: Russkij Pravoslavnyj Bogoslovskij Fond, 1959. 243 pp.
- Alfred P. Fernbach. Soviet Coexistence Strategy: A Case Study of Experience in the International Labor Organization. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press [c. 1960]. vi, 63, \$1.00.
- Eugene Fodor, ed. Yugoslavia 1961: Illustrated Edition with Atlas and City Plans. (Fodor's Modern Guides.) New York: David McKay Company, 1961. viii, 312 pp., maps, \$4.25.
- Eugene Fodor and William Curtis, ed. Greece 1961: Illustrated Edition with Atlas and City Plans. (Fodor's Modern Guides.) New York: David McKay Company, 1961. ix, 324, maps, \$4.25.
- Nikolai Gogol. The Diary of a Madman and Other Stories. Tr. Andrew R. MacAndrew. (A Signet Classic, CD40.) New York: The New American Library [c. 1960]. 238 pp., \$0.50.
- Johannes Holthusen. Fedor Sologub's Roman-Trilogie (Tvorimaja legenda): Aus der Geschichte des russischen Symbolismus. (Musagetes, IX.) 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton and Co., 1960. 80 pp.
- Ante Kadić. Contemporary Croatian Literature. 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton and Co., 1960. 96 pp.
- Mykola Khvylovy. Stories from the Ukraine. Tr. George S. N. Luckyj. New York: Philosophical Library [c. 1960]. 234 pp., \$3.50.
- The Kilgour Collection of Russian Literature, 1750-1920, With Notes on Early Manuscripts of the 16th and 17th Centuries. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard College Lib. (Distributed by Harvard Univ. Press), 1959. \$17.50.
- Alexander Kuprin. The Duel and Selected Stories. Tr. Andrew R. MacAndrew. (A Signet Classic, CD45.) New York: The New American Library [c. 1961]. 256 pp., \$0.50.
- Wacław Lednicki. Henryk Sienkiewicz: A Retrospective Synthesis. (Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, XXVIII.) 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton, 1960. 81 pp.
- Edgar H. Lehrman, ed. and transl. Turgenev's Letters: A Selection. New York: Knopf, 1961. xxvii, 401, xvi, \$5.00.
- Leonid Leonov. The Thief. Tr. Hubert Butler. (Vintage Russian Library, R-1005.) New York: Vintage Books, 1960. xvii, 519, \$1.45.
- Albert B. Lord. The Singer of Tales. (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, 24.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1960. 309 pp.

- Lillian McCrea. Polish Folk Tales and Legends. London: Pitman and Sons [1959]. vii, 88, \$2.15.
- Thomas F. Magner. Russian Tales: A Reader for Intermediate and Advanced Students. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company [c. 1960]. vi, 238, \$3.75.
- Elsa Mahler. Die russischen dörflichen Hochzeitsbräuche. (Veröffentl. der Abt. für Slavische Sprachen und Literaturen des Osteuropa-Instituts [Slavisches Seminar] an der Freien Universität Berlin, Vol. 20.) Berlin, 1960. xvi, 508, DM. 60. [Sold by Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.]
- Philip E. Mosely. The Kremlin and World Politics: Studies in Soviet Policy and Action. (Vintage Russian Library, R-1002.) New York: Vintage Books, 1960. viii, 557, x, \$1.65.
- Ivo Omrčanin. Graziano e la Croazia. Chicago: Istituto Storico Croato, 1958. 53 pp.
- Ivo Omrčanin. Istina o Draži Mihailoviću. München—New York, 1957. 320 pp.
- Richard A. Pierce. Russian Central Asia, 1867-1917: A Study in Colonial Rule. Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1960. viii, 359, \$7.00.
- John Reed. Ten Days That Shook the World. Ed. B. D. Wolfe. (Vintage Russian Library, V-719.) New York: Random House [c. 1960]. lxviii, 439, \$1.45.
- J. B. Rudnyčkyj, comp. and ed. Ukrainian-Canadian Folklore: Texts in English Translation. (Ukrainica Occidentalia, VII, 5.) Winnipeg: Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences, 1960. 232 pp.
- Ernest J. Simmons. Leo Tolstoy. Vols. I-II. (Vintage Russian Library, R-1001.) New York: Vintage Books, 1960. xiv, 373, xiii, vi, 507, xvi; \$1.45 per vol.
- The Song of Igor's Campaign: An Epic of the Twelfth Century. Tr. Vladimir Nabokov. (Vintage Books, V-718.) New York: Random House [c. 1960]. 135 pp., \$0.95.
- Ivar Spector. An Introduction to Russian History and Culture. 3rd ed. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand [1961]. xxii, 506, \$6.50.
- I. S. Vaxros. Naimenovanija obuvi v ruskom jazyke, Vol. I: Drevnejšie naimenovanija, do petrovskoj epoxi. (Annuaire de l'Institut Finlandais d'Études Soviétiques, Supplément du No. 6-10.) Helsinki, 1959. 271 pp.
- Wiktor Weintraub. Literature as Prophecy: Scholarship and Martinist Poetics in Mickiewicz's Parisian Lectures. (Musagetes, X.) 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton, 1959. 78 pp.
- Mixail Zoščenko. Izbrannoe. Intr. Mark Slonim. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press [c. 1960]. 349 pp., \$6.00.

NEWS AND NOTES

AATSEEL Annual Meeting

The Seventeenth Annual meeting of the AATSEEL was held in the Sylvania Hotel in Philadelphia, Pa., on December 27 and 28, 1960, concurrently with the MLA annual meeting.

AATSEEL Program. The program on Tuesday, December 27, was devoted to problems of pedagogy. Helen Yakobson, George Washington Univ., presided. The morning program, on the topic of audio-visual aids in the foreign language classroom, included the following papers: "The Language Laboratory as a Supplement for Classroom Teaching," Mrs. E. Galas, Horace Greeley HS, Chappaqua, N. Y.; "'Labmanship' and Techniques of Tape Preparation," F. D. Eddy, Georgetown Univ. The afternoon session, on the topic of examination of teaching techniques and of articulation between levels, included: "Foreign Language Instruction in Elementary Schools," S. A. Blew, State Dept. of Education, Baltimore, Md.; "Russian Programs in Secondary Schools," H. Lenkovec, Fairlawn, N. J., and D. Calabrese, Pascack Valley Regional H. S., N. J.; "Glastonbury Materials," Kyra Bostroem, Waterbury School, Conn.; "First and Second Year Russian Programs in Colleges," Frances de Graaf, Bryn Mawr College; and "College Board Examinations in Russian in 1961," Mrs. Claire Walker, Secondary Education Board, Baltimore, Md.

In the linguistics section, on Wednesday morning, December 28, Morton Benson presided, and the papers read included: "Sources of Scientific Russian," David Kraus, Harvard Univ.; "The Assimilation and Range of Vocabulary in the Teaching of Russian," Catherine Wolkonsky, Vassar Coll.; and "Grammatical Neutralization in Slavic Expressive Substantives," Edward Stankiewicz, Univ. of Chicago.

The literature section, on Wednesday afternoon, was chaired by Zbigniew Folejewski, Univ. of Wisconsin. It included the following papers: "Taras Ševčenko and His Friends," Wasyl Lew, Marywood Coll.; "The Čexov Centennial Productions in the Soviet Theaters," Thomas J. Winner, Univ. of Michigan; "Dostoevskij in the Criticism of the Russian Radical Intelligentsia in the 1870's and 1880's," Temira Pachmuss, Univ. of Illinois; and "Puškins's Use of the Epigraph," Bronislaw Jezierski, Duke Univ.

AATSEEL Business Meeting. The annual business meeting was held on December 28, from 3:30 to 6:00 p. m. President Leon Twarog

summarized the achievements of the AATSEEL during the year 1960. He stated that the number of chapters has continued to grow, until now there are approximately twenty. He noted that several more chapters should be initiated, particularly in the South, and also in several individual states; he pointed out that in the case of large states, such as California, it may prove practicable to have more than one chapter, while at the same time, more over-lapping chapters, as in the case of the Massachusetts and New England Chapters may in individual cases prove desirable. He noted that during 1960 the membership of the AATSEEL increased by some 250 members, but that we are still far from the 1500 members which he had hoped to reach this year.

Professor Twarog next summarized the meeting of the Executive Council on Tuesday, December 27. He reported as follows:

(1) The nominating committee for 1961 was established, consisting of Prof. Twarog, chairman; Zbigniew Folejewski, Univ. of Wisconsin; Claude Lemieux, U.S. Naval Academy; Thomas A. Magner, Pennsylvania State Univ.; and Gleb Struve, Univ. of California (Berkeley).

(2) The Executive Council recommended certain changes of the AATSEEL Constitution and Bylaws (acted upon in business meeting; see below).

(3) The Executive Council authorized and directed the incoming President and the Executive Secretary and Treasurer to investigate the financial possibilities of converting The Slavic and East European Journal from its present lithoprinted form into a letter-press printed Journal, and to take steps toward making such a conversion as soon as it may prove to be practicable.

Next a brief informal report was given by the Editor of The Slavic and East European Journal. This was followed by an informal report by the Executive-Secretary and Treasurer, in which he pointed out the necessity of an increase in dues, in order for the AATSEEL to meet its financial obligations. (The Treasurer's formal report will be published in the Summer 1961 issue of the Journal.) Professor Deming Brown, Univ. of Michigan reported on the successful setting-up of the AATSEEL Placement Bureau, under his direction, during 1960. He noted that the purpose of the Placement Bureau is not to circulate a list of jobs among applicants, or lists of schools that teach Russian, or to provide its service for people who want it without the fee of \$10 each year each name is active—for the Bureau must be self-supporting; but that the purpose of the Placement Bureau is to make available without charge to prospective employers the dossiers of those seeking positions and who are currently registered with the Placement Bureau. He further noted that only AATSEEL members are eligible to register. Prof. Brown noted that 114 dossiers had already been sent out to prospective employers, and he predicted that there would be a considerable growth in the use of this service, now that it is established and is becoming more generally known.

Professor Helen Jakobson next gave a report as Chairman of the Committee for Furthering the Teaching of Slavic and Other East European

Languages in the American Secondary Schools. She noted that her committee now has twenty-four members, and that the whole country is covered. She pointed out that the committee is not active as a body, but that the individual members act as listening posts for obtaining information on activities in the field and for taking individual action to further the teaching of Slavic and East European Languages in their individual areas. Prof. Jakobson pointed out that she maintains liaison with the U.S. Office of Education, for obtaining and sharing information.

Amendments to the Constitution and Bylaws, as proposed by the Executive Council, next were voted upon and unanimously passed (for the new reading, see the appropriate sections of the Constitution and Bylaws as published in the back of this issue; for the former reading, consult pp. 98-102 of the Spring 1960 issue of the Journal):

Constitution: Articles I and II were amended, to raise the number of regional Vice Presidents to six, of whom at least two shall be secondary-school teachers, and the Executive Council to eleven, and to provide that a New Yorker may always be a member of the Executive Council, since the AATSEEL has been set up as a non-profit organization under the laws of New York.

Bylaws 1 and 2 were changed to make the national dues, effective from 1961 on, \$7.00 for Active and Associate members and \$3.00 for student members for a maximum of three years, and to provide that of the dues chapters submit to the Executive Secretary and Treasurer, fifty cents will be remitted to the chapters for each active member. Bylaw 7 (c) was changed so as to set up a regular organization of sections for the annual national meetings, with sections officers responsible for the programs of these meetings.

It was next voted to have the Executive Council set up the following sections for the annual meeting of 1961:

First Day: Secondary Schools—Pedagogy and problems

Colleges—Methodology, etc.

Second Day: Linguistics Section

Literature Section

The Executive Council will name both officers of each section for 1961, and their names will be published in the summer 1961 issue of the Journal. In addition to these sections, it was announced that during the first day of the 1961 annual meeting there will be a conference on a topic yet to be chosen, and to be chaired by a member of the Executive Council. The program for the second day of the annual meeting will include the business meeting.

Next, Richard W. Leland, Oakland, California, Secretary-Treasurer of the California Chapter, presented a motion sponsored by the California Chapter concerning making a film to promote the teaching of Russian. After discussion, the motion was passed unanimously that the AATSEEL go on record as strongly approving the making of a sound film showing why Russian is a critical language, why it should be studied on various levels including junior high and high school, its uses in careers, an explanation of the language and its sounds, and

possibly including a demonstration of teaching Russian. It was further moved that the Executive Council should explore the possibilities of such a film being made, under its supervision.

The final piece of business was the report of the nominating committee, chaired by Prof. Folejewski, and election of officers. The slate of officers nominated (and elected unanimously) include the following:

President: Albert Parry, Colgate Univ.

Vice Presidents:

I College and university

Helen Jakobson, George Washington Univ. (East)

Berthold Friedl, Univ. of Miami (South)

Deming Brown, Univ. of Michigan (Central)

Herbert Bowman, Univ. of Oregon (West)

II Secondary Schools

Wayne D. Fisher, Canton Senior High School, Ill.

Claire Walker, Friends School, Baltimore, Md.

Edmond Ordon will continue as Executive Secretary-Treasurer, and J. Thomas Shaw will continue as Editor of The Slavic and East European Journal and elected AATSEEL representative to the National Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations (1960-63). Members of the Executive Council of the AATSEEL include the above-listed plus the two most recent past presidents, Leon Twarog, Ohio State Univ., and Zbigniew Folejewski, Univ. of Wisconsin. (National and chapter officers are listed on the inside covers of each issue of the Journal.)

The AATSEEL dinner was held on Wednesday evening, December 28. Roman Jakobson, Harvard Univ., gave the address. He summarized in some detail the impressive scholarly achievements in our field in Slavic countries during the past five or six years and noted that now all scholars must take their scholarly work into account. He also emphasized the great strides which have taken place in American scholarship in the Slavic field since he gave an address to an AATSEEL meeting on a comparable topic fifteen years ago. He particularly stressed the value of the new research in Slavic linguistics, involving the formulation and application of new methods which now are being adopted by the Russians. He felt that, in spite of individual works of good quality, American research in Slavic literatures has been of less relative and absolute value. He stressed the desirability of Americans' working in fields which need "new words," new methods of inquiry, especially in problems of comparative literature and of the epochs of Slavic literature inadequately treated in Slavic countries (e.g., Symbolism).

MLA Slavic Sections, NFMLTA Open Meeting

MLA Slavic Sections. A Conference on Slavistics and Comparative Literature: Romantic Fiction was held from 4:45 to 6:00 p.m. in Philadelphia, Pa., on Tuesday, December 27, with Ralph Matlaw, Univ. of Illinois, as discussion leader. Panelists included John

Mersereau, Univ. of Michigan, and Victor Lange, Princeton Univ.

Slavic 1: Slavic and East European Literatures met from 8:45 to 10:00 a.m. on Wednesday, December 27, with Deming Brown, Univ. of Michigan, as chairman, and Peter Rudy, Northwestern Univ., as Secretary. The following papers were read: "Native Poetic Tradition and the Dubrovnik-Dalmatian Renaissance," Albert B. Lord, Harvard Univ.; "An Unpublished Manuscript Work of Ivan the Terrible," Valerie Tumins, Brown Univ.; and "Alexander A. Potebnia as a Literary Theorist," John Fizer, Univ. of Notre Dame. The following officers were elected for 1961: chairman, Professor Rudy, and secretary, William E. Harkins, Columbia Univ.

Slavic 2: Slavic and Eastern Linguistics met immediately afterwards, from 10:30 to 11:45 a.m., with Thomas F. Wagner, Pennsylvania State Univ., as chairman, and William R. Schmalstieg, Lafayette Coll., as secretary. Papers read included "Basic Problems and Current Research in Yugoslav Dialectology," Pavle Ivić, Columbia Univ.; "Soviet Standardization of Russian," Morton Benson, Univ. of Pennsylvania; and "Russian Golubec, 'Grave Marker,' and Some Notions of the Soul," Felix J. Oinas, Indiana Univ. Officers elected for 1961 included chairman, Edward Stankiewicz, Univ. of Chicago, and secretary, Morton Benson, Univ. of Pennsylvania. Motions were made and carried unanimously in both Slavic 1 and Slavic 2 that henceforth the procedure be regularized, in conformity with the practice in other MLA groups, that the secretary each year automatically succeed in the following year to the post of chairman.

NFMLTA Open Meeting. Karl-Heinz Planitz, Wabash Coll., President-Elect of the National Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations, presided over the program, on Friday evening, December 30. "Retrospect and Perspective in Foreign Language Learning" was the topic of Mortimer Graves, Executive Director Emeritus, ACLS. This address was followed by a panel discussion, chaired by Henry Grattan Doyle (Emeritus), George Washington Univ. and Secretary-Treasurer of the NFMLTA, on "Tools and Teachers in Foreign Language Learning." Panelists included Mrs. Genevieve S. Blew, State Supervisor for Foreign Languages, Maryland; Edward J. Geary, Harvard Univ.; Theodore Huebener, Director of Foreign Languages, New York City Public Schools; and Edward M. Stack, Villanova Univ.

Chapter Meetings

Colorado Chapter. The organizational meeting was held on November 19, 1960, at the Air Force Academy. The following officers were elected: president, Serge Zenkovsky, Univ. of Colorado; vice presidents, Ivan Mittin, U.S. Geological Survey, Denver, and Dan Chopyk, Jefferson County School System; and secretary-treasurer, William L. Roche, USAF Academy. Paul McRill, Superintendent of Foreign Language Instruction in the Jefferson County School System, was appointed Chairman of a Membership Committee. The meeting

concluded with discussion of topics of AATSEEL and professional interest, including local chapter dues, the co-ordination of student language clubs, reciprocal visits to the various colleges and high schools to observe teaching methods, and the need for publicity of special events related to foreign language teaching. (Submitted by Prof. Roche.)

The Michigan Chapter met at Michigan State Univ. on November 12, 1960, with Nikolai Poltoratsky, chapter president, as chairman. In the morning session there were reports of enrollments in Russian and East European Studies in the various Michigan colleges and high schools. This was followed by discussion of methods, textbooks, and the preparation of high school students. After lunch, the members visited the M.S.U. language laboratory. The afternoon meeting opened with an address of welcome by Stanley R. Townsend, Head of the M.S.U. Department of Foreign Languages. Sergey N. Andretz, M.S.U., read a paper, "The Importance of the Language Laboratory," and Vera S. Dunham, Wayne State Univ., read a paper on Konstantin Paustovskij. It was decided that ordinarily the chapter would meet once annually, but that the officers may call an additional meeting, should developments warrant it. The 1960 officers were re-elected for 1961: Prof. Poltoratsky, president; Ida Paper, Redford High School, vice president, and Horace W. Dewey, Univ. of Michigan, secretary-treasurer. (Submitted by Mrs. Paper.)

The fall meeting of the Oregon AATSEEL Chapter was held as part of the Regional Foreign Language Conference cosponsored by the OEA Foreign Language Department and the State Department of Education, on December 10, 1960, in Salem. R. E. Steussy, chapter vice president, was chairman. A round-table discussion was carried on, with members present presenting their curriculum problems, textbook selections, and teaching procedures. (Submitted by Maxine E. Cooper, secretary.)

COMMITTEE FOR THE PROMOTION OF SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN LANGUAGES: NEWS

I. News of General Interest

The Russian Committee of the Independent Schools Education Board continues its valuable work under the able and energetic leadership of its Chairman, Mrs. Claire Walker. You can become a subscriber to this Committee's Newsletter by writing to Mrs. Walker at 5114 North Charles Street, Baltimore 10, Maryland. In the Committee's Newsletter one can find not only miscellaneous items of interest, but also the results of the Committee's recent poll of teachers' opinions on various methods of teaching Russian. The Committee also distributes "The Packet," a valuable collection of materials including Syllabus for Russian 1 and 2, Word Lists for Russian 1 and 2, College Board sample questions, practice materials (January, 1961), and others, at a minimal cost of one dollar for the entire collection.

The Fall Report of the Project on the Academically Talented contains this summary of the Committee's evaluation of the foreign language program in the secondary schools:

"For the best results, it is recommended that the study of a modern foreign language be begun in the elementary school (preferably grade 3) and be continued in an uninterrupted sequence for ten school years. Qualitatively there is no substitute for prolonged contact with the sound system and syntactical pattern of the second language. Only through such prolonged contact can the student most nearly approach native command and fluency. . . ."

A Progress Report on NDEA and the Russian Language: Title VI. Of 171 fellowships distributed among six critical languages, Russian led with 69 grants during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959. Russian is offered in 9 out of 46 language and area centers. Through the academic year 1960-61, 3,132 elementary and secondary school teachers will have been enrolled in NDEA summer and academic year institutions. Of these, 149 have studied Russian. Of 115 projects granted in 1959-60 for research and study, 5 are directly centered on Russian. The Modern Language Materials Project has 14 schools being used for the Master Pilot School Project in Russian.

State publications on modern foreign languages: The California State Department of Education has district enrollments in Russian Grades 9 through 12, giving names of schools and class enrollments. New Mexico and New York State Departments of Education have rosters of Russian teachers in their states.

Ilo Remer, Research Assistant in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, has prepared a revised list of materials in Russian of possible use in high school classes.

II. Conference

Indiana University was the site of a meeting sponsored by the National Science Foundation December 2-3, 1960, the aims of which were stated as follows: "To develop, and make recommendations concerning a national program for the systematic evaluation, selection, possible abstracting and/or translation, re-publication and dissemination of Russian and East European linguistic literature—with special emphasis on research materials in mathematical linguistics and information processing—for use of the American scholarly community."

III. News from Abroad

Scotland. The Minister of Education and the Secretary of State for Scotland appointed in September a committee on the teaching of Russian "to investigate the possibility of improving and extending the teaching of Russian in schools and establishments of further education of the United Kingdom and to make recommendations." The Committee is a step toward a greater knowledge of the Russian language in Great

Britain, ensuring a continuous supply of teachers of Russian, and considering the best methods of teaching the language.

Australia. Your Chairman spent seven weeks in Australia this summer on a "busman's holiday." There is not much Russian being taught there. The only university to have a Russian language department is the University of Melbourne. Their program runs to three hours of lecture and three hours of tutorial a week. The enrollment is 126. The curriculum is patterned on England's. The University of Sidney offers Russian only in its Adult Education Division.

An interesting program is being offered by Melbourne University to students enrolled in its Science Languages Department. A member of the department is assigned exclusively to giving science majors an intensive one-year course.

On the secondary school level, Russian was reported to be taught in one school, at Perth.

Helen Yakobson, Chairman

CONFERENCE: RUSSIAN IN YOUR CAREER

The Washington, D. C., Nearby Maryland, and Virginia Chapter of the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages (AATSEEL) sponsored a conference "Russian in Your Career," which was held at the George Washington University's Monroe Hall on October 22, 1960.

It has been noted that since 1957 the number of Russian language students has vastly increased. But are the students finding adequate ways in which to apply their language skills in the employment market? Are the teachers providing proper guidance? Do we need more Area Studies programs? The purpose of the Conference was to bring together students, teachers, and future employers of Russian Specialists, so that each group could have an opportunity to become better acquainted with the objectives and methods of work of the other groups, and later to have chance for proper self-appraisal.

The two-hour morning session was under the chairmanship of Mr. Leroy Benoit, Chief, Area and Language School, United States Information Agency, Washington, D. C. Distinguished members of his panel were:

Mr. Everett Chapman, Chief of Recruitment of Overseas Personnel in Germany and Finland, U.S. Information Agency;
Mr. Barry Zorthian, Program Manager, Voice of America;
Dr. Fredrika Tandler, Division of International Education, U.S. Office of Education.

Representatives of the United States Information Agency pointed out that USIA functions as the government arm responsible for explaining the United States to the people of the world, and its personnel work in this country as well as in various posts abroad. (The USIA employs about 1250 Americans for foreign service, 7000 nationals at the overseas posts, and 2600 persons in Washington, D. C.) According to present

government policies, recruitment of USIA personnel is only on a "world-wide-available" basis. One can enter foreign service through the Junior Officers Trainee Program by taking written examinations, one given for the State Department and the other especially for USIA. The Federal Service Entrance Examination (FSEE), given 6 times a year throughout the United States, also is used as the basis for acceptance to the Trainee Program. The trainee, when selected, goes into the press service, research, or business management. Junior management positions have recently seen a high rate of promotion, and, as a rule, in four to six years, these personnel can move into foreign service.

USIA's Voice of America, as well as other organizations broadcasting to the iron curtain countries, needs personnel with the knowledge of Russian and other foreign languages. (Other international broadcasting operations are Radio Free Europe, which broadcasts to Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania; and Radio Liberty, which broadcasts to sixteen language groups within the Soviet Union. The Voice broadcasts in thirty-six languages by short-wave, including English programs).

All of these need personnel who can meet the highest linguistic specifications, because work in these agencies is most exacting. It requires native fluency of speech and perfect knowledge of language structure. Ideally, the Voice of America needs those with fluency in Russian, equal fluency in English, journalistic and radio experience, writing ability, good speaking voice and good control of the voice, understanding of both U.S. and the Soviet Union, and willingness to work all hours of the day and night. Though many people can actually meet these qualifications, the competition for them from industry and the academic field is keen, and the supply which was formerly adequate because of the large numbers of immigrants, is now dwindling. Now such needs can be met by second-generation Americans of Russian descent who have retained their native fluency in the language and by students of the language who acquire their knowledge through university and college studies. Realizing the great shortage that exists, USIA maintains a special training program. The Voice will train young people who have a college major in the language and area, a working knowledge of the language, an aptitude for communication media, and a good general knowledge of the United States (history, government, and general background). It will give a year of professional training, a chance to improve their language skills, and an assignment in service.

The knowledge of Russian and other languages can be well utilized in the Division of International Education of the Office of Education. This Division cooperates with American and foreign educators in promoting the development of international education.

The International Educational Relations Branch conducts research on education in other countries and makes studies in education in other countries. It assists educators concerned with international programs, other Federal agencies, and the general public. It interprets foreign educational credentials in terms of education in the United States to help

State departments of education, certification and licensing boards, educational institutions, civil service commissions, personnel offices, and others in making their decisions on the equivalence of foreign study; provides information on foreign educational programs authorizing foreign study abroad; assists the Department of State in the development of U.S. policy on education for use at intergovernmental conferences; participates in activities of such international organizations as the United Nations, UNESCO, the International Bureau of Education.

In working in all three Branches, one must have not only a knowledge of one's own country, its culture and its educational system, but a thorough grasp of a foreign culture.

Mr. Melvin Ruggles, Vice-President, Council on Library Resources, Inc., was the Chairman for the afternoon session. Distinguished members of his panel were:

Dr. John P. Hardt, Chairman, Strategic Economic Analysis, Operations Research Office, John Hopkins University, Bethesda, Maryland;

Mr. Leon Herman, Specialist on Soviet Economics, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress;

Miss Zita G. Liepina, Acting Asst. Program Director for Area Studies, Office of Science Information Service, National Science Foundation.

Mr. Ruggles and his panel members stressed that knowledge of Russian is now critically needed by Americans for practical purposes of maintaining cultural relations and getting to Soviet published materials, so that we can come to a fuller understanding of the whole area of Soviet institutions and thought.

The main function of the National Science Foundation's Foreign Science Information Program is to facilitate communication between American scientists and scientists of the world, including Russian. Scientists communicate with each other mostly through various scientific publications rather than by direct contact. It is necessary for the Americans to understand that the world does not revolve around the United States but that the United States revolves around the world. The Foundation supports many programs on an international level to help scientists obtain information which they might need. Since 20 percent of the world's scientific literature is estimated to be published in Russian, and only 2 percent [recent statistics indicate the figure at 4 percent] of American scientists have a working knowledge of Russian; translating is a big job and an expensive one. The United States Government supported about \$1,500,000 worth of translation projects last year, and the British Government a like amount, and yet only about five percent of the Russian output in science and technology were translated. Although it is true that some scientific information from the Soviet Union is not easily available, it is important to note that the material which is available is in a large measure inaccessible to American readers, because of the language barrier.

Working in research and scientific institutions one can use his knowledge of Russian in various ways: interpreting at international

conferences—a most demanding work requiring complete oral fluency; translation of scientific publications; research in peripheral areas such as philosophy of science and history of science; and in libraries which handle Russian scientific materials.

It must be remembered that all branches of the U.S. Government are looking for Americans who are internationally minded and who have done good work in their chosen fields.

The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, composed of specialists in various fields, provides the necessary background information for Congressional Committees and individual members of Congress. Working for this branch of Government the knowledge of Russian is particularly important for it is not only reading and translating of Soviet materials, but on occasion serving as guides and interpreters to Soviet delegations visiting here and to American delegations visiting in the Soviet Union. Working in this area, one needs to be a high level specialist in the Soviet affairs—and have a thorough knowledge of the Soviet government, history, economics, and culture.

At present there is a scarcity of translators not only in the pure sciences but in the social sciences as well. Not only government agencies but also academic and private institutions are concerned with this scarcity and have embarked on programs for training Russian language specialists. Operations Research has started a Russian course; recently the Faculty Club at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the faculty of Brown University have concerned themselves with Russian instructions for faculty members. Some industrial companies have started their own training courses for personnel who want to acquire Russian, or in some cases they give time off for such purposes.

Machine translation will relieve the pressure for translators as technical problems are ironed out. However, the machine is so literal that its accuracy so far cannot be depended upon. The machines' chief usefulness will be for scanning large quantities of material, but in the present stage the machines are very expensive and require a great deal of manpower trained in the language.

At the close of the Conference it was brought out that the reason for the present scarcity of Russian specialists was largely due to the fact that in most universities Russian is relatively a new comer. One cannot train specialists in two-year language courses. A longer exposure to the language is necessary. Only when our students will start studying Russian in secondary schools, or earlier, can we look forward to the gradual alleviation of this scarcity.

Helen Yakobson

CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS
OF
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS
OF SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN LANGUAGES
OF THE UNITED STATES, INCORPORATED

Passed and Effective as of December 29, 1955, and
Including all Amendments Effective as of December 29, 1960

CONSTITUTION

I. Name

This organization shall be called the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages of the United States, Incorporated, and shall be abbreviated as "AATSEEL of U. S., Inc."

II. Purpose

The purpose of the Association shall be the advancement of the study of and the promotion of the teaching of Slavic and East European languages, literatures, and cultures on the college and on the secondary- and primary-school levels.

III. Members

There shall be five classes of membership: Active, Associate, Sustaining, Student, and Honorary. Active members shall be active teachers, present or past, in the field of Slavic or East European languages, literatures, and cultures. Associate members shall be persons interested in the said fields, and shall have all the privileges of Active members, except the rights to vote and hold office. Sustaining members shall be persons or organizations contributing to the welfare of the Association. Student members shall be students in the above-indicated fields on the undergraduate or graduate levels, and shall have all the privileges of Active members, except the rights to vote and to hold office. Honorary members shall be nationally or internationally recognized scholars in the Slavic or East European area or persons who have performed exceptionally valuable service for AATSEEL of U. S., Inc.

IV. Officers

(a) The Officers of the Association shall be a President and six regional Vice-Presidents, two of whom shall be secondary-school teachers, each elected for a term of 1 year; a Delegate, elected for a term of 4 years; an Alternate Delegate, appointed by the President for a term of 1 year; and an Executive Secretary and Treasurer, appointed by the Executive Council.

A vacancy in any of these offices occurring at any time may be filled temporarily by an appointee of the Executive Council, at its discretion.

(b) The Executive Secretary and Treasurer and the Delegate shall represent the Association as Delegates to the Executive Committee of the National Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations or to any other professional body authorized by the Executive Council. The Alternate Delegate shall serve as Delegate in case of necessity. In case the NFMLTA allows only one representative of our Association, the Executive Secretary and Treasurer will serve as Alternate.

(c) Elective officers shall be elected by majority vote at the business session of the annual meeting.

V. Executive Council

(a) The Executive Council shall have eleven (11) members, consisting of the President, the six regional Vice-Presidents, the Executive Secretary and Treasurer, the Delegate, and the two (2) immediate Past Presidents. In any year in which one of the National Officers is not a resident of the State of New York, the President of the New York—New Jersey Regional Chapter or a resident of the State of New York appointed by him shall automatically become a member of the Executive Council for that year. The President shall be the chairman of the Executive Council.

(b) The Executive Council shall administer the affairs of the Association, its action being subject to review by all the members of the Association at the Annual Meeting.

VI. Fiscal Year

The Fiscal Year and the terms of all Officers shall ordinarily begin on January 1st. The Executive Secretary and Treasurer shall provide funds for supplies and necessary expenses of correspondence and management of the Annual Meeting of the Association.

VII. Annual Meeting

The Association shall meet annually at a time and place chosen by the Executive Council. The Annual Meeting may be cancelled for reasons of a National Emergency by vote of the Executive Council.

VIII. Amendments

Any members of the Executive Council, any affiliated local or State Association or Chapter, or any group of 10 members may petition that the Constitution be amended. When approved by the majority of the Executive Council, the Amendment shall be submitted to the Membership by publication in the Journal of the Association, or during the Annual Meeting, providing that such an Amendment shall be included in the program of the Annual Meeting, or by special mailing, as the Executive Council may direct.

An Amendment disapproved by the Executive Council may be submitted to the Membership by a majority vote of the mem-

bers in attendance at an Annual Meeting. It shall stand approved if not disapproved by a majority vote cast at the next Annual Meeting after submission to the members as provided above, the members voting as provided by the Bylaws.

IX. Enabling Clause

This Constitution shall be effective immediately after approval by a two-thirds majority of those voting upon it during the 1955 Annual Meeting.

BYLAWS

1. Membership. Active and Associate Members shall pay a fee of \$7.00 per year and Student Members, a fee of \$3.00 per year for a maximum of three years. An individual or organization may be a sustaining member in any year during which he or it contributes \$25.00 or more; their names will be announced on the first page of The Slavic and East European Journal, below those of the officers of the Association. The membership fee shall include a subscription to The Slavic and East European Journal.

2. Affiliation. Within the Association, local Chapters may be organized. The Charter of a Chapter may be issued by the Executive Secretary and Treasurer and countersigned by the President upon petition by a group of 7 or more members of the National Association, after approval of the petition by the Executive Council.

Each Chapter shall forward to the Executive Secretary and Treasurer \$7.00 for each Active and Associate Member, and \$3.00 for each Student Member. The Executive Secretary and Treasurer shall remit to the Chapter fifty cents (\$0.50) of the national dues collected by the Chapter and transmitted to the Executive Secretary-Treasurer for Active and Associate Members.

3. Resignation, Suspension, Reinstatement.

(a) If a member resigns during any given year, his dues for the calendar year in which he resigns shall be forfeited.

(b) Any member who fails to pay his dues or other indebtedness to the Association within two and a half months of the time the same becomes due may be suspended at the end of such time by the Executive Secretary-Treasurer, subject to the approval of the Executive Council, and shall no longer be a member in good standing. He shall not receive the publications of the Association until these accounts are paid and he is reinstated as a member in good standing. If any old indebtedness remains unpaid for one year after the same becomes due, the member's name shall be dropped from the rolls, unless the time of payment shall have been extended by the Executive Council.

(c) The Charter of a Chapter shall be automatically suspended if a Chapter fails to remain active, that is, if it fails to hold at least one Meeting a year and forward minutes of such Meeting or Meetings to the Executive Secretary-Treasurer.

or to the Editor of the Association's Journal by December 15 of any given year. The Executive Council may waive this provision in the event of a national emergency.

(d) Reinstatement of a Chapter shall be effected by a compliance with Bylaw 2.

4. Committees. The President shall have the power to appoint the Chairmen, indicate the scope of, and discharge Committees as he may deem necessary. Each Committee may adopt such rules as are necessary for the orderly conduct of its affairs, subject to the approval of the Executive Council. Committee members are to be appointed by the Committee's Chairman at his discretion.

5. Nomination and Election of Officers.

(a) A slate of nominations for Officers shall be prepared each year prior to the Annual Meeting by a Nominating Committee, appointed by the Executive Council and consisting of not less than 3 and not more than 5 members of the Association in good standing. The slate of candidates must be released at least 24 hours before the Annual Business Meeting.

It should be the policy of the Nominating Committee to submit for the offices of regional Vice-Presidents candidates from different regions of the United States, the line of demarcation between these regions being subject to Executive Council's discretion.

(b) The election shall be by secret ballot, unless unanimously agreed by the members that it should be open, and shall take place during the Annual Business Meeting. It is the privilege of any member present to request a check of the credentials of each voting member.

(c) The elective officers of the Association shall be elected by majority vote of those present at the business session of the annual meeting of the Association.

6. Amendments. The Executive Council may propose amendments to, or the repeal of, a Bylaw or Bylaws. Any member of the Association in good standing may propose amendments to, additions to, or the repeal of a Bylaw or Bylaws by sending such in writing to the Executive Secretary and Treasurer. Such a proposal shall be circulated to the Executive Council for vote not less than 4 months before the Annual Meeting of the Association, at which time the decision shall be submitted to the general membership.

7. Duties of Officers.

(a) Officers cannot exercise the prerogatives of office until they have executed the Loyalty Oath currently prescribed by the United States Department of Labor.

(b) The officers of the Association shall perform the duties usually connected with their respective offices. The Executive Secretary and Treasurer shall publish the Bulletins, keep the records of the Association, manage the collection of membership dues, send notices of meetings, and perform other duties as directed by the Executive Council. The Executive Secretary and Treasurer shall also keep an account of the Association's funds and render an annual report during the

Annual Business Meeting. He shall pay the expenses necessary to his office, for publication of The Slavic and East European Journal, and for the management of the Annual Meeting from the AATSEEL funds. He shall make any other necessary disbursements as directed by the Executive Council.

(c) Responsibility for the program of the Annual Meeting shall rest with the Chairmen and Secretaries of sections established by the Executive Committee. The Secretary of a section will automatically become the Chairman for the following year. The new Secretary for the section shall be nominated by the Chairman and Secretary of the section, in consultation with the President and Executive Secretary-Treasurer, and elected by those present at the section meeting.

8. The Delegates to the Executive Committee of the National Federation of Modern Language Teachers shall represent the Association under the rules of the National Federation. They shall assume office as Delegates as provided by the By-laws of the Executive Committee of the National Federation. In the event that a Delegate cannot attend the Annual Meeting, he shall notify the Executive Secretary and Treasurer, who will inform the proper Alternate. If no alternate can attend, the President shall be empowered to appoint a temporary substitute to attend the session in question.

9. The Executive Council shall prepare a formal agenda of the Annual Business Meeting of the Association. Such agenda shall allow time for new business, which may be introduced by any member of the Association in good standing.

10. The latest edition of Robert's Rules of Order shall be the authority in any question of parliamentary procedure at any meeting under the auspices of the AATSEEL of the U. S., Inc. The President may appoint a Parliamentarian for the Annual Meeting, to advise on questions of procedure.

11. The Executive Secretary and Treasurer, as publisher of the journal of the Association, may also be its editor, or the Executive Council may at its discretion name another person as Editor, for a term of not more than four years. The Editor of the Journal is not ipso facto an Officer of the Association or a member of the Executive Council, but serving in the capacity of Editor of the Journal shall not cause anyone to be ineligible for any office of the Association. The Editor may name the members of an Editorial Advisory Committee.